



Office of Worker and Community Transition
United States Department of Energy

Seventh
National
Stakeholder
Workshop
Summary Report

Chicago, Illinois

May 27 - 28, 1999

**SEVENTH
NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER
WORKSHOP**

SUMMARY REPORT

**Chicago, Illinois
May 27 - 28, 1999**

Office of Worker and Community Transition

U.S. Department of Energy

November 1999

To May 1999 Workshop Participants:

The Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Worker and Community Transition (the Office) held its Seventh National Stakeholder Workshop on May 27-28, 1999, at the Chicago Marriott Downtown in Chicago, Illinois. Approximately 225 participants attended representing the Department of Energy, DOE contractors, labor and community representatives, and local elected officials.

These Workshops are an opportunity for the Department to highlight elements of Departmental policies and to identify areas needing more formal policy. Most importantly, these Workshops bring together local elected officials, union representatives, community representatives, contract managers and Department of Energy staff in one location to discuss the intersecting issues accompanying the dramatic change in the Department's activities.

The May 1999 Workshop addressed the progress made on the issues and challenges identified at the last stakeholder's meeting in Alexandria, Virginia, on June 17-18, 1998. We also covered the full range of the Department's work force issues and sought answers to the challenges of implementing the Department's post Cold-War mission, work force planning and restructuring, early site closure, reuse and conversion, worker safety during cleanup, and the labor policy on privatization. The format of the meeting focused on discussions of best practices and lessons learned in the process of obtaining an effective and efficient work force. A **Workshop Summary Report** is enclosed in this mailing for your information. For more information on the Office's activities, access our web site at www.wct.doe.gov.

If you have any questions concerning the enclosed document, please contact Sheila Dillard at (202) 586-1311. Again, thank you for your time and support of our activities in the mutual interest of resolving complex work force and community transition issues.

Sincerely,

Gary K. King, Ph.D, J.D.
Acting Director, Office of Worker
and Community Transition

Enclosure



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION ii
 Plenary Sessions ii
 Small Group Discussion Sessions iii

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1999

 Welcome and Introduction 1
 Reuse and Conversion 2
 Group Discussions – Concurrent Session 1
 1A. Leasing Process 6
 1B. Understanding Business Location Decisions 15

 Program Status/Questions and Answers 18
 Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise 20
 Group Discussions - Current Session 2
 2A. Labor Policy for Privatization 26
 2B. Training and Re-skilling the Work Force 30

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1999

 Early Site Closures 36
 Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 3
 3A. Long Range Manpower Planning Challenges 43
 3B. Pension and Benefits Portability 48

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1999

 Labor Issues at Department of Energy Sites 51

APPENDIX A - FINAL PARTICIPANTS LIST 57

APPENDIX B - WORKSHOP AGENDA 82



**SEVENTH NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP
SUMMARY REPORT
May 27 - 28, 1999
Chicago, Illinois**

INTRODUCTION

On May 27-28, 1999, the Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of Worker and Community Transition convened its Seventh National Stakeholder Workshop at the Chicago Marriott Downtown in Chicago, Illinois. Approximately 225 stakeholders attended representing DOE headquarters and field offices, contractors, labor organizations, state and local government, education and community interest groups.

The Workshop addressed the progress made on the issues and challenges identified at the last stakeholder's meeting in Alexandria, Virginia, on June 17-18, 1998. The full range of the Department's work force issues were discussed and sought answers to the challenges of implementing the Department's post Cold-War mission: work force planning and restructuring, early site closure, reuse and conversion, worker safety during cleanup, and the labor policy on privatization. The format of the meeting focused on discussions of best practices and lessons learned in the process of obtaining an effective and efficient work force.

The format of the Workshop included several plenary sessions and a number of small group discussion sessions. The small group sessions focused on topics related to labor issues, work force restructuring, work force planning, community transition, and employee concerns. The sessions provided a wide range of views on worker and community transition issues.

PLENARY SESSIONS

The plenary sessions of the Workshop included presentations on the following topics:

- Welcome and Introductions;
- Reuse and Conversion;
- Program Status/Questions and Answers;
- Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise; and
- Early Site Closures.

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION SESSIONS



The small group discussions provided an opportunity for direct, informal dialogue among Workshop participants on a wide range of issues. The Thursday, May 27, discussion groups included the following topics:

- Leasing Process;
- Understanding Business Location Decisions;
- Labor Policy for Privatization; and
- Training and Re-skilling the Work Force.

The Friday, May 28, discussion groups focused on the following topics:

- Long-range Manpower Planning Challenges; and
- Pension and Benefits Portability.

On Thursday, May 27, a meeting was arranged between Bob Alvarez, Bob DeGrasse and all labor representatives who attended the Workshop. The labor representatives identified ten issues for further discussion. The approach was to look at each issue and allow the Department an opportunity to respond to each concern. The ten issues that were identified were: National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993, section 3161; security personnel; effect of downsizing at the Kansas City Plant; preferential contracting to disadvantaged and minority firms; consolidated contract for weapons across sites; environmental cleanup standards; training efforts; problems with integrated contracts; and University contract management.

If you would like more information on the Workshop format, or if you would like to obtain copies of handouts from the Workshop, please call, fax or e-mail your request to:

Sheila Dillard
Office of Worker and Community Transition, WT
U.S. Department of Energy
Forrestal Building, Room 6E-034
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585-0110
Phone: 202-586-1311
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-Mail: sheila.dillard@hq.doe.gov



**THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1999
PLENARY SESSION**

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

**Speaker: Robert San Martin, Manager
Chicago Operations Office**

Mr. Robert San Martin welcomed everyone to the Seventh National Stakeholder Workshop and noted that Chicago was an appropriate city to host the meeting. He provided a brief history of both the work force restructuring and community transition activities of the city. He felt that Chicago was a model of transformation from an industrial and manufacturing economy to a dynamic economy of finance, service, and technology. The transformation of Chicago's neighborhoods paralleled the city's overall economic changes and modeled many of the challenges faced by DOE in a time of change.

Mr. San Martin said that future work force reductions will be influenced by external factors such as federal budget decisions. Beyond funding shifts, the Department faces a number of challenges in managing its contractor work force, reducing the dependence of communities on DOE over the coming years, and productively reutilizing assets that are no longer needed for the Department's missions. These challenges include:

- \$ Assuring that early closure sites retain the skills they need to meet ambitious completion targets while providing for career transition to employees who will be displaced;
- \$ Responding to issues raised by the Chiles Commission on maintaining our nuclear weapons expertise;
- \$ Implementing new, more efficient contracting mechanisms;
- \$ Promoting reindustrialization of facilities, when possible, to provide for economically productive use of assets in ways that can save the taxpayers up to \$1 billion;
- \$ Developing strategies that can provide opportunities to relocate trained workers who have security clearances from sites where their skills are needed.



Mr. San Martin said successfully meeting these objectives will demand a cooperative, integrated approach among the Department, its contractors, workers and their representatives, and community leaders.

He said the Workshop provides an opportunity to have dialogue among those affected by DOE programs. The Workshop can be a catalyst, but is clearly only one step in an ongoing communication and implementation process.

REUSE AND CONVERSION

Facilitator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Howard Weitzman, National RE/sources

Jim Hall, Oak Ridge Operations Office

Ken Tindall, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Richard Kiy, Office of Environment, Safety, and Health

Dr. Barry Lawson, founder of Lawson and Associates, introduced the session topic and speakers. He also gave a brief overview of what would be discussed. This plenary session focused on various approaches to reuse and conversion and identified emerging issues associated with the DOE's reindustrialization activities at Mound, Hanford, and Oak Ridge. Reuse and conversion challenges faced by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the private sector would also be discussed.

Mr. Howard Weitzman with National RE/sources, an independent operating company founded in 1996, began by saying that his company acquires and remediates environmentally-challenged properties. Even though properties usually exhibit some problematic level of environmental concern, one must look at each of these within their own merits, realizing that problems create opportunities. Each troubled property needs to be carefully examined and a determination made as to how value can and should be added.

National RE/sources' primary focus is locating opportunities for developing real estate in cities and suburban areas that are historically passed over by developers. One possible reason is that it is good public policy. Second, there are numerous opportunities in these communities. Third, National RE/sources can utilize its existing remediation expertise. Finally, by investing in real estate at its lowest value, the projects are counter-cyclical to the normal economy.

Brownfield sites are present in virtually every city in the United States. A smart place to begin development activities of these sites is usually where the most good can be achieved more quickly



and is the most visible, and that usually means the inner city areas. Mr. Weitzman also expressed his dislike for the term “brownfield” because it suggested a waste land.

Remediation efforts are directed toward economically targeted investments in real estate. There needs to be a viable redevelopment plan, a cleanup plan that will work, reduced environmental liability, and a willingness to take risks. But, risk-taking must be appropriately targeted.

Mr. Weitzman described the projects as models for public/private partnerships. National RE/sources is focusing on economically viable projects. A streamlined process has been developed for the acquisition phase. The first step is to locate real estate that has income potential. The project must have the potential of generating at least \$5 million in income. Second, the project must fall within the "acceptable" range of the environmental risk matrix. This can be large or small, but the projects are most likely medium-sized parcels. Residential properties are more complicated because of the higher level of cleanup required. One must also weigh environmental versus political contaminants, that is, how people have actually perceived the condition. Customized insurance plans need to be packaged to protect the seller. The seller must feel comfortable that he/she can walk away and not be held liable down the road.

National RE/sources has three major programs: corporate, development, and retail. The corporate program involves the redeployment of contaminated real estate owned by medium/large companies. These companies tend to keep the property to avoid liability from selling. The development and retail programs are new concepts that involve the extension of new lands. Mr. Weitzman provided several examples of successful transformation projects.

Examples of recent remediated efforts included an outdated contaminated facility in Grand Rapids, Michigan, that was converted into a business park with new tenants, as well as a residential community in Tarrytown, New York (about 30 miles from New York City).

The next speaker was Jim Hall, Manager of the Oak Ridge Operations Office. He stated that Oak Ridge began its reindustrialization program in 1996 when the site began planning its strategy for the future. Budgets were decreasing along with the work force; Oak Ridge needed a new way of doing business. Initial efforts included the transfer of the K-25 site to the private sector through the creation of an industrial park. The park was a way of celebrating cleanup, cutting costs, providing an opportunity for long-term employment, and developing a partnership with the private sector. The industrial park sent the message that the site wasn't just simply going away.

The site primarily uses three methods in its reindustrialization program: bartering, leasing, and contracting. To date, the site has 48 leases in place, 19 companies on site, and 811 new jobs have



been created through the program. The British Nuclear Fuel Ltd. (BNFL) cleanup contract has saved \$550 million in remediation costs of the 1401 building. The maintenance of the facility infrastructure of many facilities have been leased to private companies, such as Operations Management International, through the Community Reuse Organization of East Tennessee (CROET). Services are offered to DOE and commercial tenants at a reduced rate.

Oak Ridge is also working with other sites such as Hanford to establish a reindustrialization program. The 300 Area at Hanford is being considered for transfer to the private sector as a pilot project of the partnership. Several other small partnerships involving metal recycling are in place between Oak Ridge and other sites.

Mr. Hall concluded his presentation by identifying several keys to success. He noted that reindustrialization was not unique – tools and assets are being applied them in a different way. This requires creativity to overcome barriers when they arise. The private sector will quickly lose interest when bureaucratic processes result in schedule delays or missed commitments.

Mr. Ken Tindall, Chief, Federal Facilities Response Section, Superfund Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, provided a summary of the reindustrialization activities at the Mound Site. He noted that the site is transitioning from cleanup to reuse activities and is undergoing site closure as well. He described it as a “fun and challenging” effort. He provided a geographical representation of the site and the parcels of land that had been converted to industrial use.

He briefly highlighted four issues of discussion: development of the Reuse Plan, environmental characterization, institutional controls, and changing the Reuse Plan. The Plan acts as a guide and focuses overall efforts, which will save money by the end of the project. The report also helps to establish cleanup standards. Mr. Tindall noted that the local Community Reuse Organization, the Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation, was instrumental in the development of the Reuse Plan.

Mr. Tindall noted that one of the challenges is integrating waste characterization with reuse. He stressed communication and balance when dealing with competing goals. Mound also chooses removal over remedial processes for the majority of the site’s remedial actions. The removal process is usually acute and time-sensitive, while the remedial process is usually long-term chronic. This is achieved through flexibility as well as a good relationship between the reindustrialization and cleanup teams.



An identification and understanding of the institutional controls is necessary. There needs to be a balance between reuse and environmental protection and a knowledge of the various responsibilities. For example, at Mound, the DOE will be responsible for monitoring.

Finally, unexpected funding opportunities may result in changes to the Reuse Plan. Changes to these plans can be required for a number of reasons including unexpected funding opportunities that might arise, or boundary changes that are needed to accommodate road construction. Buildings that were set for demolition may be changed by the Reuse Team as a result of new characterization data. In summary, he re-emphasized the need for communication and funding.

The final speaker was Richard Kiy, Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for the Office of Environment, Safety, and Health, DOE. Mr. Kiy discussed the role of leasing in the reindustrialization process and stressed the need for DOE to have a formal leasing policy. He indicated that the policy is in draft stage and that a baseline environmental assessment would be a component of the document. A graded approach will be adopted in order to classify workers at low and high-risk facilities. He conceded that the issues are complex but, as examples in the previous presentations have shown, a balance can be struck between workers and reuse concerns.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q: Mr. Weitzman was asked the price of the rental units in a refurbished residential development in Tarrytown, New York.

A: He estimated monthly rental payments of \$1,500 - \$2,000 per month, depending upon square footage.

Q: Mr. Hall was asked how employees at East Tennessee Technology Park were classified.

A: He noted that a formal policy is being developed but they are currently listed as co-located, non-rad employees.



GROUP DISCUSSIONS – CONCURRENT SESSION 1

1A. LEASING PROCESS

Moderator: Deborah Swichkow, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Speakers: Tim Fischer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Brian Nickel, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Art Kleinrath, Miamisburg Environmental Management Project
Oba Vincent, Miamisburg Environmental Management Project
Terry Tracy, Office of Environmental Management
Mike Church, Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers

This session was designed to provide a forum to discuss the critical steps for successful DOE leasing, including the roles and responsibilities of the field office, the relationships between the Field and Headquarters, the State, OSHA, and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and involvement by members of the public.

Deborah Swichkow, Deputy Director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition, introduced the session topic. Ms. Swichkow noted that the leasing of Departmental property is a complicated issue, as it requires coordination with federal and state levels as well as with labor unions and members of the public. The Department is currently in the process of developing policy to protect the safety and health of workers at DOE-leased facilities. Ms. Swichkow then introduced the session speakers. Speakers included Brian Nickel of the Ohio EPA, Office of Federal Facilities Oversight Division; Art Kleinrath, the Department of Energy's Remedial Project Manager for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act at the Mound Plant; Tim Fischer, EPA Remedial Project Manager at the DOE Mound Site; Terry Tracy, a Nuclear Engineer from the Office of Site Closure within the Office of Environmental Management; Oba Vincent, Deputy Director of the Miamisburg Environmental Management Project; and Mike Church, President of Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical & Energy Workers in Oak Ridge, Tennessee.

The first speaker, Tim Fischer, noted that his work is conducted in collaboration with Brian Nickel, of the Ohio EPA, and Art Kleinrath, of DOE. Mr. Fischer provided a brief overview of the Mound site and the integrated management of the Mound Environmental Management Project. In the past, Mound served as a metallurgical research and fabrication facility, but presently, the site mission is to remediate and close the site by 2005. In the future, it is anticipated that ownership of Mound will be transferred to the City of Miamisburg, Ohio, for use as an industrial park.



Mr. Fischer noted that through his presentation, he would clarify the responsibilities of the core team members of the Miamisburg Environmental Management Project, as well as describe the DOE Mound Building Disposition Process. Further, the presentation would help clarify information to be included in a Building Data Package for determining protectiveness, as well as the decision criteria to be used for determining protectiveness at Mound. The players whom are essential to achieving the site's exit mission include DOE site personnel, the U.S. EPA, the Ohio EPA, Babcock & Wilcox of Ohio, Inc. (BWO), Miamisburg Mound Community Improvement Corporation (MMCIC), and the public. DOE site personnel are responsible for cost, scheduling, and resource and program management and integration. Members of the U.S. EPA are responsible for ensuring regulatory compliance and representing public interest. Members of the Ohio EPA are responsible for ensuring regulatory compliance and representing state and local interests. BWO is responsible for providing technical expertise, managing the project, and executing agreed-upon activities. MMCIC is responsible for providing input on desired future use for buildings. Finally, the public is responsible for providing comments and reviewing Core Team recommendations. In order to operate effectively, a balance must be struck between all of these participating groups.

The primary members of the Core Team developed the "Concept Mound 2000," which is a management concept in which the key players break down barriers by working as an integrated team and reach consensus on critical decisions in order to move the project forward. Mound has applied this concept by identifying and assessing problems preventing integration, developing a fundamental integration approach prior to designing specific integrated management tools, and implementing the approach and determining appropriate tools as required during implementation.

Mr. Fischer then proceeded to describe the DOE Mound Building Disposition Process. The process includes the following: (1) the DOE mission in a building ends, MMCIC requests a building, or privatization starts in a building; (2) shutdown activities are performed in a building; and (3) existing information is gathered for use in a Building Data Package or Structure Specific Supplement. Following these steps, the team determines whether or not the building is to be reused. If not, the building demolition process begins. If a building is considered for reuse, any Core Team decision will then go to the public for review and comment. The public is given thirty days in which to respond. When any building is considered for disposition, it must go through a series of determinations, such as whether it is protective of safety and health of potential workers. The benefits of this type of process include the identification of all concerns before initiation of an action plan and public involvement from the onset of the process through the end.

Mr. Fischer noted that information that must be investigated and gathered for inclusion in a Building Data Package includes the following: (1) site description and history (e.g., location and



description, building characteristics, process history); (2) a review of records (e.g., past sampling data, data on lead paint and asbestos, data on radon, listing of chemicals removed from the building, history of past spills and releases); and (3) information from site investigations and interviews (e.g., contractor walk-through, radiation survey). The gathered information is then placed in a "Building Evaluation Matrix," that includes environmental concerns associated with the building, proposed resolutions for those environmental concerns, and a schedule for resolution.

Building Decision Criteria include both chemical and radiological criteria. After a cleanup action has been completed or a building has been binned as No Further Assessment, a recommendation for No Further Assessment is completed by the Core Team for lease and/or transfer. Leases are conducted pursuant to section 3154 of the National Defense Authorization Act (Hall Amendment), which requires that a letter be sent to the U.S. EPA requesting concurrence to lease. Transfers are conducted pursuant to Mound FFA and CERCLA 120(h), which require that a letter be sent to the U.S. EPA requesting concurrence to transfer a site that is included on the National Priorities List. Concurrence must be received from EPA before any property from the Mound site is released for lease or transfer.

Mr. Fischer stated that, to date, 72 buildings have completed the building disposition process, 21 buildings have been approved for reuse (i.e., lease or transfer), 15 buildings have been leased, 31 buildings have been demolished, 20 buildings have been removed via auctions, and a 14-acre parcel of property was transferred in March 1999.

The next speaker, Terry Tracy of the DOE's Office of Environmental Management (EM), discussed EM's role and objectives in the Department's overall leasing process. EM is a large program within the Department, which aids in the disposition of excess facilities. EM serves as the Program Secretarial Office assigned to the Ohio Field Office, among others. EM is responsible for many sites requiring disposition and provides funding for cleanup programs that ultimately lead to disposition of the sites.

Mr. Tracy noted that EM's program objectives include the disposition of excess DOE facilities and sites by: transitioning the facility or site to the General Service Administration (GSA), selling the facility or site (e.g., Pinellas), cleaning the facility or site for reuse, and flattening the facility or removing the contaminated soil and burying it in a waste repository. The Office of Worker and Community Transition (the Office) also has a number of objectives that are relevant to the Department's leasing efforts. The Office's leasing objectives or goals include: assisting communities facing DOE downsizing, assisting in the diversification of the economy in areas dependent on DOE employment, and assisting in the creation of new employment opportunities



for workers facing the loss of DOE employment. In contrast, EM's leasing objectives include the facilitation of the ultimate disposition of the facility or site, the reduction of operating costs and overhead, and the reduction of cleanup costs. It should be noted that unlike the Office, EM does not spend funds on or sponsor the Department's economic development program; EM is legally prohibited from spending funds on this program. EM is able to accommodate leasing if these efforts lead to disposition, reduce cleanup costs, reduce operating costs and overhead or do not interfere with cleanup.

Due to this difference in leasing process objectives between EM and the Office, Mr. Tracy explained that it is necessary for the Department to resolve these differences efficiently. Policy issues should be resolved at Headquarters, while accommodations and interpretations should be implemented in the Field.

Mr. Tracy stated that DOE also engages in Leasing Implementation Reviews. The Field conducts reviews at both Area Offices and Field Offices. Headquarters Program and Oversight also conduct reviews in order to make sure that all objectives are successfully met.

EM has identified several issues inherent to the leasing process. These issues include: financial accounting for site services; environmental compliance, including both oversight and permit holding liabilities; safety of operations, which includes impact of tenant operations, impact of DOE operations on tenants, regulatory oversight, and training of employees; and, security, including access control and protection of equipment and classified information; facility baseline assessments; and emergency planning.

Mr. Tracy explained that in past successful leasing efforts conducted at the Pinellas and Mound sites, decisions were made at the Principal Secretarial Officer level. Success was attained in large part to extensive staff discussion and issue resolution. At larger EM sites, site-specific issue identification and resolution occurs by Headquarters and Field staffs.

EM released its interim leasing policy on January 7, 1999. Mr. Tracy noted that the emphasis of this policy is on requiring formal identification and resolution of issues. EM believes that the Department requires a leasing policy that entails a non-political and non-prescriptive process. The policy should include a formal process of issue identification and resolution. The process should recognize the varying degrees of risk posed as well as the program benefits of reduced cleanup costs.

The expectations that EM has for the Department's leasing policy include the following: (1) that hazards and risks are formally identified and evaluated, (2) that risks are assessed realistically and



tenant employees are adequately informed, (3) that the work carried out in the facilities by tenants and around the facilities by the DOE is within the bounds of the safety analysis, (4) that the responsible regulatory authority is identified and actively overseeing operations, (5) that environmental releases are monitored and in compliance with applicable permits, regulations, and laws, and (6) that tenant employees are protected to at least the same degree that DOE protects its own workers.

Oba Vincent, Deputy Director of the Miamisburg Environmental Management Project, then presented a discussion on the remediation efforts underway at the Mound site, as well as the Mound leasing process. Mr. Vincent noted that Mound has based its leasing process on mutual trust, cooperation, and results in order to attain success. Mr. Vincent first provided a background of the Mound site. Mound is a National Priority List (NPL) site situated on 307 acres, 10 miles south of Dayton, Ohio, completely housed within the City of Miamisburg, Ohio. Mound partners with the Reuse Organization, City officials, regulators, and stakeholders concerned with the safe and efficient reutilization of the Mound site. In September 1994, DOE entered into a general purpose lease with MMCIC. Thus far, 18 buildings have been leased in accordance with the Hall Amendment. In January 1998, DOE and the MMCIC entered into a sales contract for the Mound site.

On March 18, 1999, the first parcel of property (approximately 14 acres) was transferred by deed to the MMCIC. Mound is currently working with its partners to transfer the next parcel (approximately 14 more acres) in late July 1999. At present, 30 businesses are under lease with the MMCIC with about 310 employees.

Mr. Vincent then addressed the ways in which he believes Mound has reached its success. First, a Reuse Partnership Council was formed by the Office and EM to effect the sale of the site. This Council meets bi-weekly to facilitate discussion among decisionmakers. Next, there is a core team comprised of remedial project managers from the Ohio EPA, U.S. EPA and DOE. The Core Team meets at least two days each month and is concerned with environmental, safety and health issues. If the core team cannot reach an agreement on an issue, then dispute resolution management occurs. Success has also been achieved through a transition planning team and through help from site transition managers from DOE and BWO.

Two more parcel transfers are being planned in the next 13 months resulting in 50 percent of the site being transferred. By the end of 2004, DOE will have transitioned all of the available Mound property. The MMCIC goal is to establish 80 businesses with 2,023 employees by 2010.



Mr. Vincent noted that the main lessons learned through this process include: (1) that the formation of partnerships is effective, (2) that there is a great need to maintain open communication, (3) that the work force must be integrated into the process, (4) that there is a need to leverage resources to support transition, (5) and that there must be effective integration of all site personnel. Mr. Vincent stressed that success does not come easily.

The final speaker, Mike Church, of Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers (PACE), described the impact of leasing activities on workers. PACE, Local 5-288, has represented workers at the East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP) at Oak Ridge for 52 years. PACE, Local 5-288, at one time, represented as many as 3,000 workers but this total has since decreased to 430 workers. Mr. Church stated that contrary to what many may believe, the workers are not opposed to reindustrialization; however, certain aspects of reindustrialization do cause concern. The CROET was established and funded through section 3161 money to help mitigate impacts to displaced workers. When CROET was developed, its goal was to create quality jobs in the region by making available to private sector companies abandoned or underutilized facilities, equipment, land, technologies, and personnel. Currently, there are 22 sublease tenants on site with a reported 174 employees. Each sublease the CROET signs contains a provision in which the lessee must commit to give a hiring preference to displaced DOE site workers. Mr. Church stated that, unfortunately, it is difficult to identify which and how many of these employees are actually displaced workers. Many of the employers view this process as an intrusion of privacy and the confidentiality of the company's personnel records.

A main concern of workers at ETTP is that many of the leased buildings are occupied and are being utilized for activities in opposition to their own work. Further, consideration must be given to the number of jobs lost versus the number of jobs created before signing a lease. Finally, Mr. Church emphasized that it must be recognized that the most important aspect at any site is the human element--the worker. The worker should not be forgotten when considering the possible impacts of reindustrialization or leasing of Departmental property.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: There are certain protections which are applied when the Federal Government transfers facilities. Which ones do you apply in your process?

A: We follow CERCLA 120(h), which requires DOE to disclose any contamination that exists on the site and send a letter to the EPA to request transfer of a facility. The letter must inform the EPA that all contamination has been remediated and promise that if any



further actions are necessary in the future that DOE will take responsibility for those actions.

Q: Other than DOE, are there other agencies, like the EPA, that offer protections or “no liability” conditions when property is transferred?

A: Our current policy is that we do not apply EPA protections, but we do write comfort letters that spell out the protections included in CERCLA 120(h). Writing comfort letters is part of our policy at present.

Q: Do you go beyond the community in your outreach techniques? Do you have a business component to attract area businesses? Who determines whether a building can or should be used in the future for business purposes if the business community is not included in the outreach process?

A: We have hired firms to conduct commercial assessments in order to determine market and financial realities, but we have some unique facilities that lack a market even though their testing capabilities may be the best. Even if land or a facility is environmentally clean, there may be a lack of market for that land or facility. We do what we can and invest in it to bring it to commercial standards.

Q: How many jobs were there at Mound originally?

A: In the late 1980s to early 1990s, there were 2,300 to 2,500 jobs (employees) at Mound.

Q: Of the number of jobs that are at Mound now, how many were transferred from pre-existing jobs?

A: About 60 percent of the jobs at Mound were transferred from pre-existing jobs. Many of the businesses which were later formed at Mound were by former employees (who also hired former workers). Some new business types were established, and some business types remained unchanged; only the worker compensation changed. One of the issues in terms of offering future opportunities to site employees is the question of whether or not employees wish to work with the firm. There is no way the CROs can guarantee that workers can come back to work for the firm if their capabilities do not match those needed. A skilled labor force is extremely valuable. Few facilities have the same function for carryover of workers.



Q: My question is in regards to the use of the Hall Amendment. We have authority under 161(g) as well as other authorities to lease DOE facilities. Why was the Hall Amendment chosen for use at Mound and what are the advantages and disadvantages of leasing using the Hall Amendment versus other authorities?

A: We have used 161(g) authority under the Atomic Energy Act as well as the Hall Amendment. The Hall Amendment was enacted to ensure that regulators would have a role in the leasing process. It is conceivable that we could have fallen into a different model, but we want to work with all regulators, members of the public, and stakeholders. Further, it is good to have a signed paper in which DOE and EPA have both agreed that a building is suitable for lease.

Q: What is the relation of 161(g) to the General Services Administration (GSA) process?

A: General Counsel has stated that we have authority under 161(g) to lease DOE property. We also have authority to do so under the Hall Amendment and the GSA process. We have not used the GSA process, but it is an option. Our interest is to not have our property go through the GSA process. At Grand Junction, an agreement was worked out among various properties in order to accommodate Federal Agencies without disrupting their economic conversion opportunities. The decision of when to use the Hall Amendment versus other leasing authorities is still being debated by the principals in Headquarters. There is a document that was previously distributed in Headquarters which delegates the decision of which authority to use to each Field Organization.

Q: I've noticed that the Oak Ridge Office's relationship with EPA has been strained. EPA has apparently been dragging its feet in regards to leasing issues at Oak Ridge. Is this a problem in Ohio too?

A: Without knowing the specifics, I cannot comment on the process at Oak Ridge. But, no, this does not seem to be occurring at Ohio. We had an agreement from the start that the Hall Amendment would be used. Brian Nickel and I (Tim Fischer) identified the information that we needed to evaluate protectiveness from the beginning.

Q: I see better cooperation between EPA and DOE in some places versus others. Is Headquarters coordinating this?



A: This is a concern. One person’s “dragging their feet” could be perceived as another person’s need for more information or time prior to making a protectiveness decision. This is the paradigm shift that has taken place in Ohio. If you had asked eight years ago whether the EPA was dragging their feet in regards to leasing issues in Ohio, I may have said yes, but today, I would say no.

While the leasing process at Mound is cited as a success story, success did not happen overnight. We have experienced some long, hard battles, but we are now all on the same side.

Q: (Statement) Oak Ridge has used both available legal authorities for leasing. Section 161(g) has not been used exclusively. There is no difference between these legal authorities as far as the safety and health of workers is concerned. One should not believe that the Hall Amendment is superior in protecting the safety and health of workers.

Could the size and location of the facility be the secret to Mound’s success as opposed to a larger site situated farther away from the public?

A: We don’t believe that the size and/or location is a large factor in the success of the leasing process. Some sites have a higher level of contamination and may take longer to clean up; but, it is still necessary to have a good working relationship among players. The process we have used at Mound can work anywhere.

The City of Miamisburg had no interest in having DOE go away. There was a lot of political pressure which helped this process.

One of the reasons for Mound’s success was the sharing of a vision that was articulated by the community. The desire to make the process work was critical to the success of the project. The same vision could be shared at any site. However, it should be noted that it took a combination of different elements – community involvement, political pressure, and private sector investment – to make the process successful.

1B. UNDERSTANDING BUSINESS LOCATION DECISIONS

Moderator: Robert Baney, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Speakers: Steve Stoner, Arthur Andersen, LLP

Roy Korkalo, Livingston Rebuild Center

Ed Burgess, South Carolina Department of Commerce



Jim Watts, Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers

Mr. Robert Baney, the session moderator, opened the session by introducing each panel member and explaining that the various speakers would give their perspective on the elements of business relocation decisions.

Mr. Steve Stoner, Arthur Andersen, LLP, began his presentation by noting that his organization spends a considerable amount of time analyzing the business location decisions of corporations. The research indicates that companies are not relocating but are really expanding existing or beginning new operations in selected communities. He recommended that community economic development organizations customize their marketing packages because each client is unique, even in the same industry.

The first of a five-step process to a successful “Economic Development Delivery Blueprint” is understanding your client and their market. This requires investment of the required time to understand the client’s business and constraints. The product from the initial phase will be a high-level list of criteria that is important to the company. In phase two, the criteria will be applied against various lists of communities. Mr. Stoner stressed the importance to community leaders to make sure their communities were in the various national databases. In phase three, the top ten communities are selected by this initial screening and asked to submit a proposal that addresses some of the specific needs of the client. After the responses are collected and analyzed, approximately four communities are selected for site visits. Phase four involves the validation of the data received and the collection of additional information for the final presentation to the client. The final negotiations of incentives and the site selection occur in phase five.

Mr. Stoner noted that economic incentives are not as important today as in the past. Incentives are one component but companies today are more concerned with the skills and costs of the work force. He provided a list of five characteristics that are common among all Andersen clients. Companies want to work with communities that take time to understand their business, are regionally focused, are flexible, provide customized service, and committed to the process. Mr. Stoner reminded the group to include corporate real estate managers in all marketing programs.

Mr. Stoner noted that “closing the deal” is one of most difficult parts of the process. He felt communities should stay focused on customer’s goals, keep commitments, be honest and consistent, present a united front, and offer assistance during transition. After the deal is complete, the ongoing client service is also important. Economic development organizations need to establish mechanisms for measuring customer satisfaction.



Mr. Stoner was asked “What was the most dynamic variable in the process?” and he stated that interpretation of incentive packages and their value tend to be the main source of negotiation.

Roy Korkalo, President, LRC Northwest (LRC), spoke on their expansion from Montana to the Tri-Cities area in Washington state. LRC Northwest is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Livingston Rebuild Center, which is a locomotive repair firm that did not have any service facilities in the Northwest. The company negotiated a lease with DOE for 16 miles of rail track that will be used in conjunction with repairing locomotives. Mr. Korkalo presented pictures of several different locomotives and facilities that will comprise LRC’s operations. The company has teamed with local colleges to provide individual classes or degree programs to train the local work force. LRC is also partnering with an international firm to increase the barge and rail traffic in the Northwest. Preliminary information from a feasibility study is promising. In addition, Mr. Korkalo said LRC is working on a research project with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory that will provide real-time analysis of locomotive oil resulting in lower repair and maintenance costs.

Mr. Ed Burgess, South Carolina Department of Commerce, began his presentation by pointing out that the Savannah River Site (SRS) was the third government facility in the State of South Carolina that had been affected by downsizing. The closure of the Air Force Base in Myrtle Beach and the Navy Shipyard in Charleston were two facilities that had undergone restructuring before the SRS. The state has had to utilize its resources and assets. The State established a Regional Office of Commerce in Aiken, South Carolina, that could focus on the impact of the restructuring of nearby SRS. Mr. Burgess said the State of South Carolina established incentive programs to attract industry to the area. His experience has been that tax incentives are still critical factors for companies in the final decision process.

Efforts have resulted in the creation of a 1,200-acre industrial park where SKF, a leading manufacturer of ball bearings, and others have located at the park. Bridgestone/Firestone located an approximately one million square foot tire manufacturing plant adjacent to the park. In addition, a 1,600-acre industrial park is scheduled to open in June 1999 on the opposite side of the SRS. Since June 1996, 1,375 new direct and 2,475 indirect jobs have been created in the region. All these efforts were supported by DOE’s Office of Worker and Community Transition. Mr. Burgess credited the “can do” attitudes of local, state, and national officials.

Mr. Burgess explained the interface between the State of South Carolina and Georgia. He conceded that competition exists but pointed out that the Community Reuse Organization is a two-state organization with board members split 50/50 between the two neighboring states. He also cited several examples of successful joint projects.



Mr. Jim Watts, Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers Union, discussed cooperative ways for interest groups to work together to bring new business to their area. He spoke briefly about his experiences working with labor and business to attract new businesses to the Tri-Cities area near the Hanford site. He stressed effective communication as a requirement for getting labor, business, and DOE to work together. Each party must also understand the basic interests of the others. Labor wants job security for their members and a working life after DOE's mission is completed. Business wants profits for their shareholders and continued growth while maintaining a safe environment for their workers. DOE wants to complete tasks in the best and safest manner while maximizing the use of the taxpayer's dollar. He also added that communities want a viable tax base and an economic life after DOE with a decent standard of living for their citizens.

Mr. Watts followed with several examples of how labor, business, and the government have worked together to attract new businesses or expand existing ones to improve local economies around government sites. He knew that the attendees were trying to attract businesses to their sites as well as trying to maintain budgets to complete existing tasks. He conceded that DOE was prohibited from lobbying Congress for additional funds but economic development and labor organizations can act effectively as advocates for communities. He cited the section 3161 program as an example of how this can be successful.

He also suggested that DOE find and market the companies that need the highly-skilled and readily-available work force around the DOE sites. Mr. Watts added that the high-tech abilities of the DOE laboratories could also be an effective incentive for businesses. The work force, however, must be willing to adapt and learn new skills. Privatization is usually not acceptable to labor groups, explained Mr. Watts, but additional examples of success stories are needed to further acceptance among unions.

Mr. Watts was asked to define labor's relationship with the Tri Cities Industrial Development Economic Council (TRIDEC). The Community Reuse Organization for Hanford, TRIDEC, requested labor representation in their organization in order to fill a gap in their marketing program.

PLENARY SESSION

PROGRAM STATUS/QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Speaker: Bob DeGrasse, Director
Office of Worker and Community Transition



This session provided an opportunity for discussion on the status of the Worker and Community Transition Program, as well as a chance for workshop participants to ask questions regarding the program and its status.

Robert DeGrasse, Director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition (the Office), first provided a brief update on the Office's budget request for Fiscal Year 2000. Mr. DeGrasse stated that the request for \$30 million had been approved by the Senate, but that the Appropriations Committee in the House of Representatives had not made a final decision. While the requested amount of \$30 million is a significant reduction from last year, Mr. DeGrasse expressed his appreciation of the Senate's approval of the budget request and indicated that the Office would not be certain of the exact figure until late June or July. The Office will then better understand its financial status and future outlook.

Mr. DeGrasse highlighted the Office's four main program strategies or goals, including: (1) management of employee retention and career transition; (2) promotion of the flexible use of the skilled work force; (3) support of local economic diversification and development; and (4) transfer and reuse of excess Departmental property and facilities. Mr. DeGrasse stressed that people are the key to accomplishing the program tasks. For instance, early closure strategies depend upon having the right employees working until the very end. The Office is currently developing mechanisms for encouraging retention and separation at the appropriate moment.

Mr. DeGrasse noted that the Office's program strategies are important for a number of reasons. First, contract changes, outsourcing and privatization can result in costly and disruptive employment transitions. The Office has established means for retaining skilled employees and avoiding severance costs while implementing changes. The strategy of economic development assistance is important in that it helps local communities reduce their reliance on government activities and promotes partnerships between local officials and the Federal Government. Finally, the transfer and reuse of excess Departmental property brings local communities together with the Department to accomplish common objectives; namely, closure and reuse of excess assets. Mr. DeGrasse stressed that the agency is aware of the ongoing limited liability of all tangible assets leaving the Department.

The Office of Worker and Community Transition seeks to facilitate change by ensuring the fair treatment of workers and communities. The Office has specifically provided funding for enhanced separation payments in FY 1999 and FY 2000. Further, it has provided funding to communities that should help create roughly 1,700 jobs in FY 1999 and about 1,700 jobs in FY 2000. The Office has also provided funding to support work force planning, facilitate asset conversion and reuse, oversee labor relations and perform other program direction activities. Due in part to the



Office's efforts, the Department is achieving its missions with 46,000 fewer contractor employees than in 1993, with only 28 percent involuntary separations, and is saving at least \$3.3 billion annually for a one-time investment of \$837 million.

Mr. DeGrasse explained that work force planning has been effective in supporting site closure. The Office is developing programs that will encourage workers to remain at DOE sites for as long as their skills are required and then separate voluntarily. The goal is to "leave something behind" and allow workers to move directly to new employment from completion of their DOE tasks. For small initial investments, the payoff will be smaller severance payments and the ability to fully utilize the skilled work force to achieve rapid site closure. The ability to make this transition smoothly is difficult. Reskilling the work force in preparation for transition has proven to be a difficult challenge to address. The Office believes that fairness of opportunities for the existing work force and efficiency in site closure can go hand-in-hand. Examples of success in this area are Oak Ridge, Portsmouth, and Paducah.

The Office believes that fair treatment of workers is conducive to good business. Since 1992, DOE contractors have reduced their work force by nearly one-third, with annual savings over \$3.3 billion. Over 70 percent of the separations have been voluntary and have not resulted in significant legal challenges or labor unrest. Significant savings and productivity gains are being realized through the use of new contracting mechanisms, while retraining current workers with their unique experience and skills. At Oak Ridge, for example, a new cost-saving contract provides pension and service continuity, coordinated work force planning, and assured employment offers. This employment continuity will make possible the transition of nearly 6,000 workers to task-oriented subcontractors and avoid immediate potential severance liabilities of up to \$45 million.

Mr. DeGrasse noted that the biggest and most controversial challenge for the Office as it seeks to accomplish its goals has been public perception and community involvement. It has proven difficult to prompt individuals to understand and recognize the benefits of economic diversification. If the agency is to have a good relationship with communities, then it needs to work with them to decide together how best to diversify the economy. The leadership of the agency is committed to continuing onward with these strategies in order to accomplish its goals.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: At Rocky Flats, there has been a problem with providing ongoing health care premiums for retired workers. There will be tens of thousands of people without health care coverage as a result of closure. Has the Department given consideration

**to this problem?**

- A: I do not want to speak on behalf of Rocky Flats' management, but we are aware of this problem and we recognize that it is the responsibility of DOE to provide coverage to its employees. Annual appropriations must be utilized to fulfill this responsibility. We are concerned with the liabilities associated with the agency's actions. We do recognize this existing problem and our responsibility to alleviate it.

MAINTAINING UNITED STATES NUCLEAR WEAPONS EXPERTISE**Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates****Speaker: Robert A. Hoover, President, University of Idaho**

Dr. Hoover was a member of the Congressionally-established Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise, chaired by Admiral Hank Chiles (United States Navy, Retired), which recently completed its mission and presented its final report to Congress. Dr. Hoover presented an overview of the report, including the reasons for establishing the Commission, its specific task, membership, methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report to Congress can be found in its entirety on the DOE's Home Page at (<http://www.dp.doe.gov/public/chilesrpt.htm>).

Commission Task. The task of the Commission, described in the 1997 National Defense Authorization Act (as modified by the 1998 National Defense Authorization Act) was to “develop a plan for recruiting and retaining within the DOE nuclear weapons complex such scientific engineering and technical personnel as the Commission determines appropriate in order to permit the Department to maintain over the long term a safe and reliable nuclear weapons stockpile without engaging in underground nuclear testing.” To complete its task, the Commission sought to identify actions that the Secretary may undertake to attract qualified scientific, engineering, and technical personnel into the nuclear weapons complex.

Commission Membership. In addition to Admiral Chiles and Dr. Hoover, other members included Dr. Bob Barker (Assistant to the Director, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory), Charles Curtis (Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.), Dr. Sid Drell (Deputy Director, Stanford Linear Accelerator), Dr. Roland Herbst (former Associate Director of Nuclear Design at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory), Dr. Henry Kendall (deceased--Professor of Physics, MIT), and General Larry Welch (United States Air Force--Retired, CEO of Institute for Defense Analysis).

Research Methodology. The Commission utilized a number of research methods and sources of data in order to gather the relevant information necessary to carry out its mandate. The members



solicited overviews from DOE and weapons complex site principals, conducted site visits (including management overview meetings, tours and talks with the work force, focus group discussions, and individual meetings with employees), and utilized personnel surveys. They also compared industry and laboratory situations regarding recruiting and retention of qualified personnel, consulted academia (both faculty and students) concerning recruitment for the types of skills needed to operate the nuclear weapons complex, and held discussion with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Navy, Air Force and Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

General Findings. The findings of the Commission were presented under three broad categories; (1) DOE has management/program planning problems, (2) its work force is aging and insecure, and (3) the weapons complex is operating in a highly competitive marketplace (providing the greatest challenge for the future supply of technical personnel in the history of the U.S.). Dr. Hoover focused his remarks on the findings “specific to the personnel issue,” the aging work force, and concurrent competition for the necessary talent to replace that work force as it moves to retirement age. He compared the work force of the nuclear weapons complex to similar categories of workers in the national work force. In all cases, the nuclear weapons work force was characterized as having a preponderance of personnel nearing retirement age in the next decade and an insufficient influx of personnel entering the work force to counter that trend. Dr. Hoover underscored the “war of talent” for those entering the work force with the requisite skills to operate the nuclear weapons complex. With the lowest unemployment in decades, particularly in those technical fields needed by the nuclear weapons complex, and average salaries increasing significantly, the marker for individuals entering the work force with these skills is highly competitive. A look ahead at current hiring trends and projected hiring needs at selected laboratories clearly illustrates a widening gap between the need for technical workers and the ability to satisfy that need.

Summarizing the findings regarding personnel issues, Dr. Hoover noted that the Commission’s research suggests that there is a declining number of graduates in the skill areas needed, with a large segment of international students in those skill areas (further limiting the talent pool to choose from), and a growing number of women in those areas (with some evidence that they have a greater reluctance than men to choose employment in nuclear weapons programs). Further, there is a large segment of the population (Generation Y) entering college now that needs to be addressed, but may also have a similar reluctance to entering nuclear programs. Finally, in addition to the intense competition for the skill areas, there is a relative unawareness of the college community regarding the labs and production facilities and a perception that design and development opportunities are limited. No nuclear weapons complex plan appears to exist to address these trends, which will lead to significant management program planning problems.



Commission Recommendations. Dr. Hoover presented the Commission's recommendations under four categories: national commitment, program management, personnel policies, and oversight (a more detailed description of the recommendations can be found in the Report at the web site noted above).

National Commitment

- Reinforce the national commitment to and fortify the sense of mission of the nuclear weapons complex.

Program Management

- Complete an integrated, long-term Stockpile Life Extension Program.
- Strengthen the DOD-DOE relationship.
- Take immediate steps to achieve greater laboratory coordination.
- Expedite improvements and efficient use of the nuclear weapons production complex.
- Establish clear lines of authority within DOE.

Personnel Policies

- Establish and implement plans on a priority basis for replenishing essential technical work force needs in critical areas (hire now at a rate necessary to replace skilled work force in years ahead, reestablish presence on university campuses, expand internships and post-doctorate research opportunities, adopt best practices of competing industry, enhance recruiting flexibility).
- Provide contractors with greater expanded latitude and flexibility in personnel matters.
- Expand training and career planning programs which are adapted to the dramatically changed work force environment.
- Expand the use of former nuclear weapons program employees.

Oversight

- Create a permanent defense programs advisory committee.
- Enhance Congressional oversight.

In conclusion, Dr. Hoover stressed four points; (1) work force insecurity is a real problem, (2) DOE organizational change is necessary, (3) there must be an emphasis on hiring, training and



retaining personnel (in the near-term), and (4) action and support is required from Congress and the Department of Defense.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q. Rocky Flats has many lower skilled workers who are responsible for the actual “hands-on” aspect to making products. Many of these workers will be lost. What will DOE do to retain this particular skill area and those people responsible for actually creating DOE’s products (as opposed to just the highly-skilled engineers and scientists)?

A. Scientists and technologists are both needed to do the job. Skilled training in the area of technology can only be learned through five to eight years of apprenticeship. This study included technicians as well. The retirement bulge will make the loss of technicians worse if we do not work to replace both elements--the designer and the maker--the Commission’s study focuses on both.

Q: The Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board also made many similar recommendations as far as training and education of personnel (DNFSB 93-3). The General Accounting Office has also emphasized the need for training. What is your perception of the support and funding that may be offered in support of these current recommendations?

A: These recommendations definitely concern me. If the transfer of knowledge is not made, we will face significant difficulties. The potential impacts are unknown at this point and may not manifest themselves until years from now, but if we do not bring in new people now we will undoubtedly face a serious crisis in five to ten years. This point is being addressed in Congress right now. Action must certainly be taken immediately.

Q: You spoke about a lack of integration between Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. Has any thought been given to closing one and sending the sum of funding to the other?

A: No. It is a good dimension to have competition. It facilitates the avoidance of needing outside peer review.



Q: One of DOE's concerns is the need to review compensation, among other factors. Some are concerned that the removal of DOE from personnel practices will lead to a bidding war for talent. Did the commission review this?

A: Yes. There already is a bidding war going on. If a contractor is hired, it should be given the opportunity to manage successfully--allowing more flexibility, including in areas of compensation. It is necessary to have that latitude in order to be successful. We are not likely to be in an expanding labor pool for seven to eight years, so it is crucial to review such factors.

Q: After this study was addressed on the Hill, the Senate Armed Services Committee noted that they were ready to take action. To what level are the DOE Secretary and the Hill going to go to deal with these issues?

A: A 120-day study on the issue was introduced. There has been a reassignment of responsibility in DOE, as well as extensive discussion among lab directors regarding the best way to handle this problem. The labs are placing importance on establishing a growing presence on college campuses--these steps are unfolding, but the process is slow.

Q: You mentioned that there is an increasing number of women attaining advanced degrees, but that there is a perception of limited upward mobility for women in the discussed fields. I noticed that the commission conducting the study consisted of all males and that the directors were male. What is being done to address this problem?

A: The numbers indicate that there are many women versed in the necessary skill areas. However, in our discussion groups on campuses, we noted an absence of knowledge among females on nuclear labs and plants. The perception is that the Field is not as amenable to women. We noted a different response at Georgia Tech--there is a large group of women in the complex and there are many female alumni suggesting to younger women that the scientific field can provide a satisfying career. We definitely need a more focused recruitment effort. We don't recruit women and minorities for scientific fields in the same way that we recruit men. We have to have different tactics to entice them to enter the Field. We must work hard to explain the advantages and ask more focused, specific questions. If we must recruit that element of the population, and it is essential that we do, we will have to be more imaginative and creative than we are now.

Q: What was DoD's response to this report?



A: The response at DoD is one of increasing awareness of these issues and problems.

GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CURRENT SESSION 2

2A. LABOR POLICY FOR PRIVATIZATION

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Walter Howes, Contract Reform and Privatization Project Office
Bob Alvarez, Office of the Secretary, Department of Energy
John Meese, Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO
Richard Miller, Allied Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers
Mary Ellen Boyd, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO

Dr. Barry Lawson introduced the session topic and speakers. He also gave a brief overview of what was to be discussed. This session focused on the policy options for work force and labor relations issues related to changes in contracting mechanisms, including privatization and outsourcing. The Department of Energy (DOE) is seeking to establish policies to create a cooperative rather than a confrontational labor-management environment for dealing with potential changes in contracting mechanisms.

Mr. Walter Howes, Director of Contract Reform and Privatization Project Office, DOE, noted that he had held his position for only 15 months and it seemed like yesterday that he joined the Department then, at times, it felt like 15 years. In order for the Department to improve overall operations, there needs to be a stable mission, stable management and stable money. Unfortunately, DOE has had none of these. Employee incentives and reward programs need to be more aligned with performance. The people “moving the ball forward” should be rewarded. His office is working toward the overall concept of “higher performance/higher profitability.”

The mission of his office is privatization and contract reform. He said contract management needs “tuning up” and project management needs to be improved. This involves defining risk and refining business practices across DOE. He explained these goals are difficult and come with tension. However, all areas of the work force need time to deal with the changes. The Department has learned that economic development needs to be performed by the organizations with the appropriate skills, such as the Office of Worker and Community Transition.

He closed by introducing a pilot project that DOE is beginning with the Office of Management



and Budget (OMB) that looks into all the issues confronting workers during work force restructuring and contracting strategies at Rocky Flats. He noted the tough challenge of creating incentives for workers to remain at a closure site. He also noted the scope of the project is not completely finalized. One attendee suggested additional sources of employee perspectives than OMB.

Mr. Howes was asked, “What about the closure contract at Rocky Flats? The area in Denver is thriving. There is a need to create an environment which says that it’s better to stay until the bitter end. The work force needs to be involved.” He said there still remains many changes that are needed for contracting reforms.

The next speaker, Mr. Bob Alvarez, Senior Policy Advisor to the Secretary of Energy, began by saying that in this capacity, he is responsible for environmental, safety, health, and labor policy issues. He also emphasized the corporate complexity and enormous size of the DOE.

The Department owns one of the largest industrial complexes in the Nation, and is responsible for the largest government-owned industrial research and development enterprise in the United States. It’s a very diverse industrial complex consisting of a wide variety of very specialized and technical assets. When compared to the private sector, its assets would place it high (would rank 25-30) among the largest of the Fortune 500 corporations.

He reminded the audience that the Department has agreements with 37 unions, one of the most extensive relationships among all Federal Agencies. The DOE, while not a private corporation, still has social responsibilities. Impacts of any facility shutdowns need to go beyond the environmental concerns and worker safety issues. The economic ramifications upon a community, which can be devastating, must also be examined very judiciously. Even though DOE is redefining its mission, it still dominates the wage structure of some major geographical areas.

He stated that a Department-wide labor policy existed during production but the end of the Cold War has resulted in additional issues not covered in the original policy. He explained section 3161 of the National Defense Authorization Act was created to provide the basics but it does not include the needed wage, benefit and pension policies. Mr. Alvarez stated that even though there is presently no labor policy in place, a good policy can be forged only after there has been clearly defined roles regarding health and safety, i.e., let the workers know what they’re getting into; an open dialogue with labor leaders, i.e., earnest discussion of what is happening at sites (for better or worse); the realization that sites must be accountable to those offices supplying the money; and recognizing that those offices supplying the funding are accountable for policymaking.



Mr. Alvarez noted that DOE has the unique responsibility of self-regulating. In some cases, working conditions have suffered. Therefore, the Department has a responsibility for developing a policy. He said the Secretary is going to announce a new initiative that will provide a more equitable treatment of workers stricken by excessive exposure to beryllium, asbestos, radiation, and that the universe could eventually reach 600,000. He said the Department is committed to strengthening the health and safety for workers and fostering a better dialogue with labor. He called it a “major initiative” and asked for community and labor support. He encouraged everyone to seek out and introduce themselves to some of the new managers across the complex.

Mr. Alvarez was asked about future changes to the successful voluntary protection program (VPP) at the Kansas City Plant. He said the Department will leave them alone if they’re working well.

Mr. Alvarez responded to questions regarding work force restructuring at Portsmouth and the Treasury Department agreement to limit layoffs to 500 employees. He said the Department is working to honor this agreement. However, he conceded that it was a complex issue involving DOE, the United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC), Bechtel Jacobs, and the labor unions. The issue has the attention of the Secretary so he expressed his hope to reach a suitable compromise. The basic game plan is to transfer workers to Bechtel Jacobs to work in the environmental management program or look for alternative sources of funding to keep people employed.

Mr. John Meese, President of the Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO, told the audience he has had extensive experience dealing with the issue of privatization. He is convinced it is outsourcing, not privatization. He cited three of the most often quoted reasons for outsourcing: work exceeds the ability of the worker, work exceeds existing technology, and work can be done cheaper.

Cost is listed as the most often reason for outsourcing. Mr. Meese defined the three cost elements of any product as: materials, manpower and profit. He said the goal of outsourcing activities is usually to get something at a lower cost. Many times, the cheaper product is derived by keeping the same levels of material and profit, and adversely affecting manpower. Companies use more people at low wages or few people at higher wages in order to complete the job. This is wrong, he stated.

Mr. Meese said new contractors should recognize existing labor agreements provided the same skill mix is available. In addition, outsourcing decisionmakers must consider the impact on the existing contractor. There is loss of control that sometimes results in long-term human misery. He briefly highlighted the partnership between the contractor and protective force at the Kansas



City Plant. He closed his remarks by encouraging all unions to continue to do tasks cheaper and make the employer more profitable.

Mr. Richard Miller, Policy Analyst for the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers Union, opened by stating that the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Union merged with the Paper Workers Union to form Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers Union, which is now 330,000 members strong. He stated that because of the Congressional efforts attempting to sunset this program, the Office of Worker and Community Transition (the Office) came very, very close to getting zeroed out (this was included within a draft of the House Defense Authorization Act). However, he noted that the most current bill language has the Office shutting down in 2003.

Mr. Miller restated language from a March 12, 1997, letter from Tom Grumbly, Under Secretary of Energy, to Bob Wages, Executive Vice President of the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers Union, that committed to develop a privatization policy with respect to labor at the last DOE Stakeholder Workshop. Two years later, that commitment has not been honored. Mr. Miller questioned the commitment of the Administration to follow through, in kind, given the opposition expressed by the Department's Field Offices.

The Office's "Privatization Report" was released without a labor policy and labor officials were not asked to participate in the development of the document. The next attempt at a policy came in the form of a "checklist" from the Office. It also was met with resistance. Mr. Miller reiterated his frustration with the Department and the entire Administration for a continued lack of policy. Failure to promulgate a policy will result in a policy vacuum providing for continual litigation for the Department.

Ms. Mary Ellen Boyd, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, began by stating that she was pleased to hear that the Secretary of Energy is committed to improving labor relations. She was also eager to help DOE shape its labor policy as invited by Bob Alvarez. She feels we all have a responsibility of continued commitment to the communities around the DOE sites. She provided several examples of how the work of the building trades have impacted DOE's mission. She felt just as we honor veterans of the Cold War, the workers contributions deserve the same praise.

Ms. Boyd asked DOE to include wages, benefits, and appropriate work classifications in their proposals. Also, the Department should build community standards into privatization projects. She added that many people think Davis-Bacon wages are inflationary but in fact, they represent the going rate. Ms. Boyd said the Federal Government should do everything in its power to



maintain them and Ms. Boyd asked that labor be allowed to participate openly and fully in decisions about the future.

Ms. Boyd conceded that change can lead to opportunity as long as all parties are involved. She was disappointed with a recent meeting between the building trades management and the USEC in regard to a privatization construction project. Ms. Boyd offered that labor only has three seats on a 44-member board of the Community Reuse Organization at the Oak Ridge site. She doubted the ability of the unions to influence decisions with less than 10 percent representation.

Ms. Boyd concluded her comments by conceding that Bob DeGrasse has a difficult task but said the building trades were willing to partner in the labor relations process.

2B. TRAINING AND RE-SKILLING THE WORK FORCE

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education (ORISE)

**Speakers: Virginia Geer, United Auto Workers/General Motors Center for Human Resources
John Clabaugh, AlliedSignal, Inc., Kansas City
Vickie Stephens, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW)**

Dr. Balcombe introduced the session topic and speakers, highlighting the challenges in managing federal and contractor training programs to assure a cost-effective means of meeting the skill requirements necessary to support the Department's mission. She noted that the session would focus on the role training can play in addressing fluctuating skill requirements. The speakers reflected a variety of perspectives, both from within the Department and from one labor organization working in private industry.

Virginia Geer, with the United Auto Workers/General Motors (UAW-GM) Center for Human Resources, began the session by describing some of the experiences of General Motors and the United Auto Workers as they relate to training and re-skilling their work force. Ms. Geer's presentation provided a unique private industry/labor perspective on the session topic. Her presentation addressed the questions: who are we, what skills are critical, what are we doing to upgrade skills of the existing work force, and what are we doing to acquire skilled workers for the future?

The UAW-GM Center for Human Resources was established as a non-profit corporation in 1984 by GM and the UAW, with a combined financial commitment of almost \$3 billion towards joint



education, and training and retraining activities to increase operation competitiveness and enhance job security. More than 260,000 UAW-represented GM workers have received over \$57 million total hours of joint training in areas such as job-related training, basic education enhancement and interpersonal and communication skills.

Ms. Geer noted that as we move towards the 21st Century, new skills and work orientations are necessary to compete. We need a more capable, committed and self-directed work force. Downsizing and aging of the work force since 1985 highlights the need for this new type of work force. Between 1985 and 1998, within GM, the UAW downsized its workforce from 405,000 to 197,000; the average age is now 45 - 47 years old. As plants were closed and employees transferred to other GM sites (some moving from assembly plants to component plants, with limited machining experience and no exposure to the team concept; with others moving from component plants to assembly plants, with no assembly experience but understanding the team concept), workers experienced cultural shifts, driving the need to train and re-skill in order to meet plant goals related to operation readiness.

Needs analyses were conducted at the plants, looking at source data on cultural shifts, employee enthusiasm assessments, and team activity statistics. The results indicated a need for some type of intervention on all fronts, with most plants deciding to focus on employee development concerns due mainly to: employee participation in business decisions were down, interpersonal conflict was increasing, and, job satisfaction and security were areas of concern. Training was the intervention of choice and Employee Development Workshops were developed to address presentation skills, facilitator skills, communications skills, interpersonal skills, conflict resolution capabilities, learning styles and problem solving.

In addition to re-skilling the existing work force, Ms. Geer noted the need to focus on acquiring future skilled workers. She highlighted a school-to-work program designed to aid in the transition from high school to the workplace and to identify and develop new employees for GM. One example of this program is the Manufacturing Technology Partnership, a two year school-to-work transition program at the GM Flint Metal Center Plant. The program is a cooperative venture between GM, the UAW, the Genesee Area Skill Center Technology Center, the Mott Foundation, all Genesee County High Schools, Mott Community College and Baker College. As of 1998, 84 students have completed the program; 79 have passed the GM/UAW Apprenticeship Test; 22 graduates are working production jobs with GM; 7 are working engineering jobs; and 5 are in skilled trades apprenticeships.

John Clabaugh, AlliedSignal Corporation, Kansas City Plant, then addressed the role of training at that particular DOE location (which was celebrating 50 years of operations in 1999), providing



another perspective on this important issue. He highlighted a history of training activity at the Plant, looking at the periods 1949 - 1993 (prior to the current consolidation and downsizing occurring within the Department) and then 1993 - 1997, addressed what was effective during the downsizing period, and what AlliedSignal is doing currently to invest in the skills needed for the future.

From 1949 to 1993, the training focus was on apprenticeship programs (e.g., tool & die, model maker, electrician, pipe fitter), traditional classroom instruction, educational assistance and Department short courses. While the downsizing was in full swing (1993 - 1997), the apprenticeship programs were discontinued due to lack of funding and the training staff were let go. Educational assistance and Department short courses continued, and computer training began to grow.

An assessment of the downsizing activities and an appraisal of successful transition program suggested the following: developing a joint union/management team to review and oversee that downsizing facilitated a perception of fairness in the process; an emphasis on communication; expansion of educational assistance; and encouraging employees to attend non-traditional classes. Whereas in the past, AlliedSignal's education focus was on those skills needed to keep the Kansas City Plant operational, now the emphasis was on an increased emphasis on self-reliance, and increased use of the Job Announcement System for job rotations, and short courses on how to find a job and what the market wants today.

In addition to being concerned about the present, Mr. Clabaugh noted that AlliedSignal is also investing in developing the skills needed for the future. The business goal of "improving competitiveness through constant learning" drives the investment necessary in human capital for FM&T (the AlliedSignal team at Kansas City Plant) to become a "learning organization." Mr. Clabaugh noted that they have shifted from a focus on training to one on continuous learning. He then highlighted several systems utilized by AlliedSignal to support the concept of a learning organization approach at Kansas City Plant, with the operating premise being to provide an opportunity for all employees to have access to information regarding all aspects of operations at the Plant. For example, the Command Media System is a web-based system that allows all associates to view documents such as the Quality Manual, Process Descriptions, and Work Instructions online.

In conjunction with this approach to learning, training has become a distributed function - with very little attempt at centralization. Each manager and associate at the Plant is responsible for training--in other words, learning is considered a part of the job. Associates develop "learning plans" that can be directly linked with Departmental goal, functional business plans, DOE



customer requirements, FM&T mission and ultimately AlliedSignal's overall mission and goals. This "line of sight" planning allows associates the opportunity to see how their plans tie into higher order goals and objectives. In addition to the online learning opportunities, associates also make use of formal training, on-the-job training, cross training, job rotation, special assignments and other initiatives. A Learning Tracking System was developed for each associate, that tracks all courses and activities for that individual.

Mr. Clabaugh then identified the costs associated with this shift from training to continuous learning, showing a significant decrease in total training costs from \$8.5 million (1996) to \$2.4 million (1999). This reflects an "on average" expenditure per associate, for those who make use of the opportunities of approximately \$1,000 per year suggesting a more cost-effective approach to maintaining and developing the skills needed for the future.

The final speaker in the session was Vicki Stephens, with the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers at the Kansas City Plant. Ms. Stephens gave a personal account of the machinist training and (former) tool & die apprenticeship program for Allied Signal at Kansas City. She first defined a skill, trade and apprentice, and then identified a number of common trades; e.g., auto mechanic, baker, bricklayer, electrician, embalmer, etc., pointing out that trades affect our daily lives in many ways. She highlighted the value of trade apprenticeship programs as a proven method of insuring that the essential skills needed to maintain the economy continue for generations. Apprenticeship programs also prepare people for skilled employment by conducting training in bona fide and documented employment settings, and strengthen the union by having set standards on wages, hours, working conditions and product quality. Further, they create a commitment from the apprentice/employee, who gains time towards seniority while continuing to make a product for the company (i.e., it's not just a classroom exercise). It also keeps the journeymen sharp in their responsibilities to oversee the apprentices.

Ms. Stephens did, however, emphasize the classroom instructional aspect of apprenticeship programs, using the tool & die program as an example. School instruction for the Tool & Die Apprenticeship Program is required in the following areas:

- Bench work (hand tools, measuring tools)
- Basic blueprint (fundamentals, interpretation)
- Basic Machining (drill press, lathe, milling)
- Basic arithmetic (fractions, decimals)
- Tool design (jigs, fixtures)
- CAD/CAM
- NC programming



- Basic hydraulics (pumps, valves, circuitry)
- Safety meetings
- Dies and molds
- Algebra (quadratics, proportions, equations)
- Drafting (fundamentals, drawing practice)
- Introduction to computers (architecture)
- Compound angles
- Communication theory and practice
- Use of the handbook
- Basic and analytic geometry

This represents approximately 900 hours of classroom instruction, or about 10 percent of the apprenticeship program (total of 8,800 hours). Clearly, there is a significant level of classroom effort, in addition to the other hands-on requirements, for completing the apprenticeship program.

Unfortunately, the apprenticeship program has been in decline over the past several decades for a number of reasons: downsizing, trends in “de-skilling” the work force, concerns that apprenticeships were union dominated programs, and the general tradeoff of long-term investment in work force skills for short-term financial gains. Ms. Stephens noted that since 1990, there have been 6 layoffs at AlliedSignal in Kansas City, laying off younger craftsmen and allowing older skilled craftsmen to retire early. At the present, there is no ongoing apprenticeship program (as Mr. Clabaugh indicated), and the average age in the tool room is 48 with the youngest person being 40 years old. The youngest employee will be eligible for retirement in 15 years. With an apprenticeship program that lasts an initial 4½ years before the very practical experience training begins, the work force will be further behind the changing technological environment without constant updated training.

Ms. Stephens discussed the future of the apprenticeship program given the current environment. A stronger economy creates a huge demand for skilled workers. Employers are recognizing skill shortages in certain areas (the next decade should see demand grow for an additional 13,700 metal workers due to overall economic growth, and another 35,300 positions open up from retirement and normal attrition). Employers attitudes are changing based on the lessons learned from not investing in apprenticeship programs during the recent lean years.

Finally, Ms. Stephens noted several strategies for reinvigorating the apprenticeship program at the local level. Employers should assess the future skill requirements of the company. Next, determine if language exists in the current contract for apprenticeship. Then contact the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training for guidance and become familiar with the resources offered by



the local community college system. The time is now to train the next generation of skilled workers, to ensure our economic growth and competitiveness.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: (John Clabaugh) Is there a link with personal goals in your “line of sight” goals and requirements?

A: Yes - for salaried personnel. It's communicated through the strategic planning process.

Q: (Virginia Geer) Are your critical skills courses conducted during company hours?

A: Yes - for that core group of personnel (Training Coordinator and Human Resources Representatives) responsible for training the entire work force. We train our team leaders on company time. For a recent product launch, that comprised about 90 hours per team leader in a six-month time period.

Q: (John Clabaugh) What accounts for the significant cost reductions you noted in the training budget?

A: Different delivery methods; for example, much of the training is now conducted online. Everyone has access to a personnel computer (some shared).

FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1999

PLENARY SESSION

EARLY SITE CLOSURES

Moderator: G. Leah Dever, Ohio Field Office

Speakers: John Bradburne, Fluor Daniel Fernald

Gene Branham, Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council

Ann Bormolini, Kaiser-Hill Company, Rocky Flats

Jerry Harden, United Steelworkers of America

This session was designed to allow representatives from Mound, Fernald, and Rocky Flats to share their on-going experiences in the accelerated closure of sites. It included discussions of cross-cutting issues, including work force planning, skills mix, and training for future employment



opportunities both inside and outside DOE. This challenge affects DOE, contractors, work force/labor and the community and will require innovative and creative solutions.

Ms. Leah Dever, Manager of the Ohio Field Office, introduced the session topic and speakers. Ms. Dever then addressed the connection between her own work at the Ohio Field Office and the session topic of early site closure. Ms. Dever is responsible for the closure and environmental restoration of five separate facility projects at the Ohio Field Office. All projects are in the Site Closure Fund and are slated for closure by 2006. Current funding for site closure projects is slightly more than \$1 billion per year and is used to fund closures at the Ohio and Rocky Flats Field Offices.

Ms. Dever stated that although the staff at the Ohio Field Office are, in essence, working themselves out of their jobs, they are well-motivated to cleanup the sites and move on. This situation is difficult to manage, but the Ohio Field Office recognizes that there is a definite need to understand and address the concerns of its staff. At the federal level, downsizing is occurring through attrition, and there is a need to fill positions quickly. The majority of the Ohio Field Office staff is willing to work at the site until closure.

Ms. Dever stated that the Ohio Field Office had predicted a need of 210 to 220 employees through 2003, with an incremental decline in the number of necessary employees as the site nears closure. The Ohio Field Office assured the staff that the workload would remain steady through 2003, but attrition is presently occurring at over 10 percent at the federal level. The Ohio Field Office hopes to offer its staff members in-house upward mobility, retired annuitants, buyouts, retention bonuses, and guarantees of other jobs at other DOE sites if they stay through closure at Ohio.

The Ohio Field Office conducted an employee survey and plans to continue to do so on an annual basis. The purpose of the survey was to determine the need of all employees to support long-term career growth. While the Ohio Field Office has not received definite results at this time, the survey resulted in a 98 percent response rate. The survey is an example of the Department's concern with the human side of business. The Ohio Field Office recognizes that it must take care of and assist its workers, although workers must also continue to take ultimate responsibility for themselves. The Department is interested in and willing to provide training to workers in order to help them move on to other jobs following closure. Frequently, the best and most skilled workers require developmental training so that they can grow professionally and transition to new employment. There is a great need to be innovative and creative in the attempt to effectively close the Department's sites.



The next speaker, Ms. Ann Bormolini, was named Vice President of Human Resources and Communications for Kaiser-Hill Company, Rocky Flats in August 1997. Ms. Bormolini presented an overview of the Rocky Flats Site Closure Project. The site currently consists of a staff of 5,000 site employees 3,000 of which are part of the Kaiser-Hill Team. The site consists of 385 acres of industrial area and 6,000 acres of open buffer space. Presently, the site has more than 700 facilities and structures, three landfills, five wastewater treatment plants, and one laboratory. The site also has water, power, steam, and nitrogen facilities, security and law enforcement services, fire protection, medical services, a road system, grounds maintenance and snow removal services, and food services. The site has large quantities of nuclear materials located 15 miles upwind of the state capital of Denver. These nuclear materials include 10.8 U.S. tons of plutonium, 3.4 U.S. tons of plutonium residues, and 7.4 U.S. tons of uranium. The surrounding community is concerned about contamination from this site reaching the metropolitan area of Denver. The mission of the Kaiser-Hill Company is to make the site safe and clean and, ultimately, to close the site. The project is expected to result in primarily open space. Buildings will be demolished and waste and plutonium will be shipped offsite.

Ms. Bormolini then presented a brief history of the Rocky Flats site. The site began its nuclear weapons production mission in 1951 and continued production through the 1980s. The site's historic weapons production mission included radioactive and non-radioactive metal working and fabrication, plutonium recovery, and research and development. In 1989, the FBI raided the site for alleged environmental crimes, and in 1992, the site's production mission officially ended. The next years were wrought with uncertainty and struggle through a morass of regulatory and stakeholder issues. In 1995, Rocky Flats was deemed a Closure Project, bringing the real focus and direction to the site mission. It was at that time that Kaiser-Hill was contracted in order to close the plant. The mission of the project is to eliminate all waste in order to effectively close the site.

Ms. Bormolini explained that the site closure team consists of DOE leadership and members from Kaiser-Hill Company, as well as second-tier contractors and hundreds of third-tier subcontractors. Kaiser-Hill has identified several work force issues, including: the need for the work force to remain committed and focused to reach closure; the need for work force assistance with individual closure planning; the need for the work force to stay as long as their skills are essential to closure; and the need to ease work force transitions to lower-tier subcontractors.

Kaiser-Hill has initiated a process for identifying work force initiative which has involved benchmarking industry and other DOE sites, the development of focus groups in 1996 surveys, and the development of focus groups again in 1999. Through this process, Kaiser-Hill has learned that employees want to remain working at the site through closure. Survey results indicated that



the average age of the Site worker is 48 and the average hourly attrition rate is 2.9 percent. The average salaried attrition rate is 5.9 percent. Through the work force initiatives process, Kaiser-Hill noted a major retention problem with firefighters and security personnel. The site is trying to retain firefighters by attempting to outsource the fire department. This would help to insure that firefighters have continued employment with a community department after closure.

Ms. Bormolini noted that the results of the work force initiatives process also indicated that: employees desire information on how the closure schedule impacts them; a commitment from the Kaiser-Hill Company in addressing individual employment expectations; and assistance in preparing for transition. Transition assistance preparation is desired in the form of adjustment of retirement programs, career planning and counseling, education and training assistance, outplacement assistance, and retention incentives if the employee stays through their personal closure date.

To date, Kaiser-Hill and DOE have established a 2006 site closure plan; adjusted the salaried retirement program; provided a lump sum option; developed a Career Counseling Center to help with individual closure planning; provided financial planning seminars; established an area network with major employers to match employee skills with area employer needs; revived business startup assistance; and coordinated with other DOE sites regarding critical skills in order to offer future jobs to workers who stay at Rocky Flats through site closure.

The following programs are being explored to determine if changes would help the site with a safe, successful closure: review of alternative retention incentives, proposal of additional service credit for age to bridge medical eligibility; consideration of additional retention/productivity incentives on a selective basis (i.e., firefighters); provision for advance access to fund training for careers outside of Rocky Flats; advance access to severance for outplacement services; adjustment of the vacation accrual policy; provision of immediate 401(k) vesting; and any other new, innovative work force transition ideas and processes.

The next speaker was Mr. Jerry Harden, President of the United Steelworkers of America. Mr. Harden has been a plutonium worker at Rocky Flats for the past 32 years and a radiation monitor for over 30 years. Mr. Harden dedicated his comments to Don Gaebel, Leroy Krumbach, John Shamber and Jim Downing, all of whom were DOE workers who died from radiation exposure at Rocky Flats. Mr. Harden then read a personal essay entitled, "DOE and Contractor Performance at Rocky Flats: Half Empty or Half Full?" The following presents a summary of issues addressed within this essay.

Mr. Harden explained that, in its prime, Rocky Flats reclaimed fissile nuclear materials such as



uranium and plutonium, in addition to fabricating atomic weapons components from new materials provided by other DOE facilities. Since the closure of production capabilities at the Rocky Flats plant, many American taxpayers have been misled by politicians and bureaucrats that the DOE would no longer produce or dismantle nuclear weapons, much less at any additional cost to them. The Federal Government and the DOE are, in fact, attempting to duplicate the production and disassembly capabilities at Rocky Flats at two new locations at a cost to the American taxpayers of \$2 billion.

Rocky Flats has experienced the introduction of multiple contractors with an integrating contractor. Further, living wage jobs have been downgraded to \$10 an hour for replacement workers due to privatization. According to Mr. Harden, this seems disgraceful in a plant that currently has an annual budget of \$657 million. Many of the small contractors are poor performers involved in work under the pretense of diversification. Many of these privatized contractors are ignorant of or avoid rules and regulations with which the rest of the workers are expected to comply. This treatment by the contractors and the DOE is unfair to the veteran work force; a work force that has dedicated its talent and compromised its health for the defense effort.

The concept of worker involvement is currently popular at Rocky Flats due to pressures exerted by the DOE. However, this interest in the work force is felt to be insincere. Mr. Harden noted that worker involvement consists mostly of worker exploitation and manipulation for appearance and profit. Labor's voice has been omitted with corporate and DOE dignitaries that routinely visit the plant. Such persons prefer to listen to corporations, landowners and real estate developers. The work force at Rocky Flats has no guarantee of quality employment until site closure, and there is no guarantee that worker health needs will be met. DOE spends millions of dollars to defend contractor mistakes that cause worker health effects, but does very little to recognize, treat, or compensate deserving Cold War Workers.

Mr. Harden closed by noting a final issue of concern--the recent phenomenon deemed, "DOE employee on Friday, contractor employee on Monday." Many talented administrators are being lured away or silenced by more lucrative positions with DOE's contractors.

The next speaker, Mr. Gene Branham, is Vice President of the Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council, located at the former Fernald Uranium Processing Site. Mr. Branham stated that although things at Fernald are presently positive, the site has experienced its share of challenges and problematic issues. Mr. Branham then stated that while other speakers would present a picture of how things currently function at Fernald, or a glimpse of the "good," he would present a picture of how things functioned historically at Fernald, or a glimpse of the "bad and the ugly."



Mr. Branham explained that, in 1989, Fernald ceased weapons production. DOE extended its contracts for one year and proceeded with its plans of remediation and shutdown. Despite the fact that Fernald ceased its weapons production, it took the Department two years to prompt Congress to admit that the cessation of weapons production had actually happened. The work force felt that it should prepare itself for the introduction of FERMCO, the contractor that DOE had selected to initiate the remediation and shutdown process, so the work force underwent remediation training. FERMCO had directions from DOE to eliminate the in-house work force; however, FERMCO did not understand that senior Senators had modified the Request For Proposal and that the in-house employees were offered continuous employment. Regardless, FERMCO planned to dispose of all but approximately 50 in-house workers; retaining those 50 workers for low-scale, low-paying jobs. Mr. Branham then vividly expressed his frustration with the fact that FERMCO did not effectively remediate the site. From the in-house work force perspective, FERMCO was not successful in their initial remediation efforts. The in-house workers notified their political supporters and strategized to retain their jobs.

Mr. Branham noted that John Meese and John Bradburne were hired to redirect FERMCO's efforts at Fernald in early 1994. Concurrently, DOE made open declarations of the eminent closures of other sites. Soon after, the parties at Fernald were able to engage in effective communication and begin to address problematic issues and frustrations. Mr. Branham explained that it was then that closure efforts at Fernald began to progress in a positive manner. Mr. Branham then adamantly reiterated that things at Fernald were defective for quite some time prior to improving.

The final speaker, Mr. John Bradburne, President of Fluor Daniel Fernald, highlighted several of Fernald's successful site closure efforts. He specifically described three particular site projects, the first of which was deemed "Safe Shutdown." The project consisted of the preparation of 10 complexes for demolition by FAT&LC members, removing more than a half million pounds of hazardous material in the process. Following safe shutdown, the facilities were turned over to a subcontractor for dismantlement. More than a half million pounds of nuclear material and thousands of gallons of hazardous liquids were removed from the ten complexes. Fernald was the first site in the DOE complex to complete safe shutdown--an accomplishment so significant that it prompted a visit from the Secretary of Energy. The Safe Shutdown Project was completed in March 1999. The project was completed two years ahead of schedule for \$7 billion less than the amount originally budgeted for the project.

Mr. Bradburne noted that the second project, the Waste Pits Project, is considered a privatization project, and involves six waste pits which were used to store waste byproducts from Fernald's uranium production process. The pits contain low-level contaminated material, mostly solid and



liquid waste such as sludge, cakes and residues. A solicitation for a lump sum bid was placed. IT Corp., the subcontractor for this project, has provided the capital investment for construction of processing facilities. To recover its up-front investment, IT Corp. will be paid for each railcar loaded. IT Corp. designed and built the remediation facilities needed to support the Waste Pits Project. Cincinnati Building Trades will excavate the waste pits and transfer the material to FAT&LC employees for processing. FAT&LC members will also be responsible for operating the locomotives, as well as inserting the railcar liners; loading the material; attaching the lids; inspecting the railcars; operating the scale; and maintaining rail yard equipment and IT Corp's remediation facilities. Employees will process approximately 1 million tons of material from the waste pits. A Record of Decision was signed on March 1, 1995, with work expected to be completed in May 2005. The total value of the project is \$120 million.

Mr. Bradburne then detailed the third project, described as the Silos Project. This project involves the remediation of four concrete silos containing residues of uranium extracted from pitchblende ores from the Belgian Congo. It is a tri-phase privatized program with the objective of remediating the silos. Silos 1 and 2 (the K-65 Silos) contain low-level radioactive waste, Silo 3 contains cold metal oxide and Silo 4 is unused. While the subcontractor will be responsible for designing and building the Silos' treatment plant, FAT&LC members will perform operations and maintenance. Under the technical direction of the subcontractor, FAT&LC members will also operate the advanced waste retrieval equipment for Silos 1 and 2. Approximately 14,000 cubic yards of waste will be removed through this project. Work on Silos 1 and 2 will begin in 2001; completion will depend on the technology selected. Design for cleanup of Silo 3 has begun and is scheduled to be complete in 2003. The cleanup plan for Silos 1 and 2 is currently being re-evaluated, with a decision on the path forward to be made later this year. Silo 3 waste will be treated by Rocky Mountain Remediation Services using a patented stabilization process. Remediation of the Silos, which contain waste from the Manhattan Project, is the highest priority project at Fernald.

Mr. Bradburne closed by stating that these three projects are examples of the progress that has occurred and continues to take place at Fernald. Each project demonstrates DOE's commitment to doing things correctly and effectively under the banner of safety and efficiency.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: (Gene Branham) To what do you credit Fernald's turnaround? What specifically happened to change the way you were feeling about things at Fernald?

A: Everything starts with leadership. Leaders need to communicate and motivate. They



can't demoralize a work force. Mr. Bradburne came to Fernald voluntarily and surrounded himself with a capable staff. He didn't look over their shoulders all the time – he trusted them. At the same time, DOE came into place. DOE understood the concept and supported it. DOE understood the game and brought it to a new level.

(John Bradburne): Gene used the word “trust.” That's what it is; without it, you can't communicate and you can't figure out how to make things work effectively. It started with Bob Schwabb. We have an aggressive oversight group at Fernald based on a lot of trust – we collectively generate it.

Q: I'm glad you feel privatization is working at Fernald, but at Rocky Flats, it is not working. It is more costly and it gives money to special contractors, which are often companies with no expertise. Then, other groups have to come in to augment the contractors' work. One subcontractor at Rocky Flats seems obsessed with institutionalizing everything along commercial standards. What is the importance of commercial standards? Even cold parts of our plant have a lot of contamination. I am very concerned. There is a lot of exposure to workers and the environment that continues to occur. Privatization has resulted in no value added at Rocky Flats.

A: (John Bradburne): On the matter of best commercial practices, my sense is that you should not check your common sense at the door. Our common sense is the biggest asset we have. Those in the business understand what nuclear hazards are all about. When you get down to the work that has to be done, we need to understand all the parameters and model activities around them. Fernald and Flour Daniel Fernald sit down together and get everyone at the table, including health and safety individuals, to plan the work. Don't let anyone check their common sense at the door.

(Gene Branham): From the outset, we put people at the table who will actually be conducting the work. We have mandatory walk-throughs at every stage of the work. When you have buy-in from everyone involved, when you get to the goal line, everyone possesses ownership and all problems are eliminated. This may not be as applicable at larger sites.

(Leah Dever): What John and Gene have mentioned is called the “Integrated Safety Management System.” Not everything is working perfectly at Ohio; there are pockets here and there that are not, but success like that which has been described does not happen overnight. It takes time and good leadership.



GROUP DISCUSSIONS - CONCURRENT SESSION 3

3A. LONG RANGE MANPOWER PLANNING CHALLENGES

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, ORISE

Speakers: Charles Emery, Sandia National Laboratory
Carl "Bubba" Scarbrough, Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Susan Alexander, Lockheed Martin Energy Systems

Dr. Balcombe opened the session by introducing the topic and speakers. The session focused on the approaches used in assuring the ability to recruit and retain a quality work force with the requisite skills and experience to meet developing Departmental missions. A particular focus was on responding to the recommendations of the Chiles Report and on ways to best meet fluctuating work skill requirements.

Mr. Charles Emery, Vice President for Human Resources, Sandia National Laboratories, managed by Lockheed Martin Corporation, was the lead contact with the Chiles Commission concerning employment, recruitment, and retention at Sandia. He began the discussion by reviewing several of the more pertinent findings and recommendation from the Chiles Report affecting his role as Vice-President for Human Resources, and described some of the actions undertaken at Sandia to meet these concerns. He pointed to the Chiles Report recommendations to (1) establish short- and long-term hiring plans; (2) rely on formal, technical education programs as a major supplier to restore an adequate flow of new talent; (3) ensure that undergraduates and graduates in engineering and technology fields are knowledgeable of DOE Laboratories and production facilities; (4) fully utilize intern and co-op programs; and (5) establish knowledge transfer programs (archiving data and training new recruits).

Next, Mr. Emery provided insight into manpower challenges and various initiatives currently underway at Sandia. With 2,000 fewer employees now than in 1995, a major goal at Sandia is not only to attract talented recruits, but to also retain them. Of primary interest is to engage students early on and create a pipeline of individuals possessing the requisite skills beginning in middle school through high school and college intern programs.

A part of successful recruiting for the long-term also involves creativity. Student enrichment programs as well as various Workshops are being used to directly engage the students with hands-on/mind-on activity. Intern programs, which focus heavily on the technical disciplines, average about 800 interns and co-ops per year. One must be able to generate an excitement in potential candidates not only about how the Sandia's mission impacts national interest, but also about the types of work in which the candidates would be engaged. A mentoring program,



embracing both social as well as technical aspects, for developing people who can respond to changing requirements and complex customer needs is another component of Sandia's effort to ensure nuclear weapons expertise. Advantages are seen from both perspectives; the mentor receives new ideas, enhances personal skills, develops networks, etc.; and the mentee learns about the company culture while receiving career guidance, and developing professional skills, etc.

Mr. Emery noted that Sandia has an integrated university program which incorporates many elements required for building a successful constituency between the Lab and the universities. Components include campus executives (or ambassadors comprised of Sandia Vice-Presidents) for selected universities; university collaborations/research focusing on such things as research portfolio management, scientific and technical strategies, minority outreach activities; and staffing/recruiting which incorporates areas like staffing planning, skills needs determination, and recruiting coordination. Sandia has 120 engineers and scientists who recruit at some 40 universities nationwide. There are also recruiting team activities which focus on university and faculty relationships to assist in identifying potential candidates (BS, MS, PhD) with a specific set of skill requirements.

There are a number of strategies in place to attract, retain, and inspire talented individuals. Strategies for attracting personnel include targeting top talent, and providing competitive rewards and an enjoyable working environment. Strategies for retaining employees include mechanisms such as recognition and rewarding; continued learning opportunities; job rotational flexibilities, including opportunities for career advancement; enhanced employee benefits; an enjoyable working environment; and a better understanding of employee needs.

Sandia has identified several critical skill-mix categories that will be in great demand during the next five years. In the technical area, there will be an increased need for people in the following major areas: computer science and software engineering; electrical and electromechanical engineering; information systems; and advanced manufacturing. There will also be a heightened requirement for those skilled in the following trades categories: machinists, mechanical measurements, electronic fabrication, mechanical systems and operations (e.g., HVAC).

The next speaker, Mr. Carl Scarbrough, President of the Atomic Trades and Labor Council, presented his perspectives regarding the future of the Y-12 facility in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The Y-12 facility was built in 1942 as part of the Manhattan Project. Its original mission was the separation of highly enriched uranium-235. The mission later evolved into a highly-sophisticated manufacturing capability for the production of components for every nuclear weapon in our Nation's stockpile.



Though functions have changed as we approach the 21st century, Mr. Scarbrough emphasized that the Y-12 facility is now critical in supporting the United States' long-term stockpile management mission. Work at Y-12 will be instrumental in maintaining our nuclear deterrent capability without the need for underground testing, and will assure the necessary high level of confidence in the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The Department also needs to maintain the capability to manufacture all current warhead components and their replacements as well as the capability, if required, to restart warhead production.

Mr. Scarbrough noted that as we near the next century, much work needs to be done at Y-12 to ensure its continued success. Realizing that many of the facilities and infrastructure systems are half-a-century in age, one must understand and appreciate the great amount of modernization and streamlining that will be needed to help assure our continued capability. Infrastructure modernization will involve additional capital investment; new, modern facilities integrated and co-located with existing facilities; and a demonstrated capability to manufacture all current warhead components and their replacements. The more modern and streamlined Y-12 will use engineered controls and contained processes, will have enhanced safeguards and security measures in place, and will operate more cleanly thus reducing its waste streams and emissions. It will be safer, more cost effective, and more efficient.

One must also remember that in addition to the modernization of facilities and infrastructure systems, the work force must not be forgotten. Mr. Scarbrough emphasized that skilled workers are critical to U.S. manufacturing, and that training is critical to enable companies to use and maintain advanced technology. The work force at Y-12 is no different--it will need to be revitalized. Critical job skills need to be retained. There needs to be a refocusing on the elements of hiring, training, and retraining to help assure a highly-skilled and flexible work force. Highly successful elements have included: a manufacturing skills campus which leverages federal facilities, technology, and expertise; train-the-trainer programs; and the use of apprenticeship programs.

The final speaker, Ms. Susan Alexander, Director of Resource Management at Lockheed Martin Energy Systems (LMES) in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, spoke about recruiting strategies being implemented by Lockheed Martin. With work force downsizing activities ongoing in the Oak Ridge area for the last several years, recruiting was not one of its mainstays and actually, LMES had last done a college recruitment effort over a decade ago.

But things have changed with LMES. A new mission has been defined for its continued work at the Y-12 facility. This mission is threefold: to effectively re-manufacture, surveil and assess all uranium, lithium, and secondary components in the nuclear stockpile while protecting people and



the environment; to safely store, process and disposition uranium, lithium and secondary components associated with the nuclear stockpile; and to perform complementary work that reduces the DOE's burden in maintaining Y-12's capability while contributing to regional economic development.

A recruiting strategy is now in the works for accomplishing its new mission. A needs assessment has been completed focusing on critical skills, age demographics, and technical specialities. Selected colleges and universities will be targeted, with the initial focus being placed upon the historically-black colleges and universities as well as those other schools which were regionally located.

Tactics used include the testing of an online recruiting, resume, and processing system (which should be ready by August 1999); the creation of a key internal recruiting team; and the use of summer intern and co-op programs.

Some obstacles to overcome included: the focus on critical skills while budgets are shrinking; bringing in new hires to replenish critical skills while overall layoffs continued; reduction in funding for conducting new security clearances; student confusion over the roles between the Department of Defense versus Department of Energy; shortage of nuclear engineering candidates; and worker health issues in a nuclear environment.

Ms. Alexander highlighted several lessons learned; including the premise that students did not generally expect a long-term employment commitment; students were more interested in meaningful, visible, technical work; mentoring and educational assistance were important to students; high importance of company name recognition; students want to hear about the company and its missions (that is, the future not the past); while salary and benefit packages were important, they were not at the top of the list (ranked behind company name and prestige, work environment, and work enjoyment).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:

Q: (Susan Alexander) How do you deal with Congressional funding issues when so often they become "iffy"?

A: By talking about the opportunities that might and could happen if Congress does indeed provide the full (or partial) amount of funding.



3B. PENSIONS AND BENEFITS PORTABILITY

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Terry Freese, Office of Worker and Community Transition
Teresa Riggs, Bechtel Jacobs, Oak Ridge
Sharon D. Ruehl, Richland Operations Office
Eugene McConville, United Plant Guard Workers of America (UPGWA)
Michael Cleghorn, National Council of Security Inspectors (NCSI)

Dr. Barry Lawson, the session facilitator, opened the session by explaining that pension and benefits are a critical issue in implementing changes in contracting mechanisms at DOE facilities. He introduced each speaker and said that each would be discussing the various approaches to this issue.

Mr. Terry Freese, Deputy Director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition, began by contrasting past DOE environments that included ongoing stable missions, life-long employment and associated benefits with the current state of new contracting mechanisms, privatization, new missions and skills requirements, and recruiting and retention challenges. He said the Department is striving for programs that produce a trained and experienced work force while minimizing costs, transition issues, and career disruption. The goal is to have the right people, at the right time, at the right place, and at the right cost. He quickly added that “right cost” does not necessarily mean the cheapest.

Mr. Freese said transitioning the remaining workers intra-contractor, between sites, and from DOE to the private sector should all be accomplished with minimal career disruption. He conceded some of the barriers of flexible work force utilization are funding and planning uncertainty, relocation assistance, and service-based benefit portability. He listed possible alternative portability options as defined-benefit and contribution, multiple employer plans, hybrid plans, and employee leasing.

Mr. Freese noted that DOE needs to clearly define future work force requirements and determine to the extent that existing workers can meet these requirements. The Department should also continue to reduce any remaining barriers to utilizing existing workers.

Ms. Teresa Riggs of Bechtel Jacobs Company gave a brief history of the benefits issues at the Oak Ridge site. She pointed out that Bechtel Jacobs was a management and integrating contractor for the Environmental Management and Enrichment Facility work at Oak Ridge, TN; Paducah, KY; and Portsmouth, OH. The contractor is using the existing work force from Kentucky, Ohio, and



Tennessee. Due to time constraints, Bechtel Jacobs established single employer plans during the first six months of operations. It was sometimes expensive and time-consuming to clone existing plans with current providers. Multiple/Multi-Employer Plans were established on October 1, 1998, that included pension plans, savings programs, and health and welfare plans (MEWA). The first subcontractor employees were transferred in October 1999. The special set-up allows multiple employer participation in the plans, and single data feeds to providers.

Ms. Riggs said Bechtel Jacobs is continuing to work on the challenges of multi-employer pension plans such as service portability and amendments of plan provisions to move between employers. In addition, MESP obtained SEC no enforcement action to operate as a multi-employer plan to ensure the company is not acting as a broker. Finally, MEWA located a Class "A" insurer to provide rich benefits in a multi-employer environment coupled with an extensive customized system data feeds and structure to meet the substantially equivalent obligation of the contract with the DOE.

Ms. Riggs summarized the challenges that Bechtel Jacobs faces in its role as a management and integrating contractor: cloning existing plans versus establishment of new providers; ratification of collective bargaining agreements; maintaining a productive, focused, work force in the midst of significant changes; maintaining benefit integrity of grandfathered employees while meeting socioeconomic goals; and providing portability of benefits. She emphasized the need for employees to know whom they worked for.

Ms. Sharon D. Ruehl of the Richland Operations Office, began her presentation by highlighting the contractual changes at the Hanford site. She said the site is looking to bring in new people as well as benchmark activities against industry standards. The DOE management style of informing employees of new policies has been replaced by requests for worker input on future activities and initiatives. She echoed the concerns made by earlier speakers to minimize worker impacts of benefit changes, increase the overall mobility of the work force, and pension portability.

Ms. Ruehl said the site's Hanover Operation and Engineering Pension Plan (O&E benefit plan) will be providing additional options in the future. Although, the site has an employee cost-share program that fits all workers, it is anticipated that additional coverage will be provided through service credits. Other planned activities include looking to the private sector for management after DOE's presence at the Hanford site is gone.

Ms. Ruehl concluded her presentation with an organizational chart that listed each of the five major contractors that report to the Richland Operations Office. She noted that each major contractor has a tier of subcontractors that add additional complexity to the organization. As an



example, she presented a view graph that depicted Fluor Daniel, Inc., having six sub-contractors and five Enterprise Companies.

Mr. Eugene McConville of United Plant Guard Workers of America, said he had been impressed with what he had heard from the other speakers in the session. He thought the section 3161 concept was good but, unfortunately, the protective force at the DOE sites had been excluded in the implementation of the legislation. He stated legislative objectives of section 3161 as preference-in-hiring and training workers to join the Environmental Management Program. He noted that seven years ago the protective forces had been passed over at Portsmouth. Workers were told they did not qualify because they had an ongoing mission. He noted the mission is still ongoing but the workers deserve an equal opportunity.

Mr. McConville felt the protective force needs to be given the same opportunity as others because of the added value of the protective force to the DOE community and long-term cost savings. But more important, "It's the right thing to do."

Mr. Michael J. Cleghorn, President of the National Council of Security Inspectors, presented the issues that are being faced by the security forces across the DOE complex. First, the retirement programs are not adequate; second, retention of the young, more physically fit worker is difficult; and third, training costs are high.

He described an environment where the current work force is getting older but pension plans are not meeting the needs of the aging work force. The Taft-Hartley Plan is the only 20-year retirement program. This scenario forces 60-year old workers to perform the same work as a 21-30-year old in an extremely physically demanding environment. Mr. Cleghorn presented employment information from Hanford, Savannah River, Paducah, and Nevada. Fifty-six percent of the workers at these four sites are over 41 years of age. At Hanford, 70.4 percent of the workers are 41 or older.

The average length of service also indicates an aging work force. Almost 75 percent of the Wackenhut employees at Nevada have over 11 years of experience. The figure is 91 percent for Hanford and almost 73 percent for Savannah River's protective force.

He noted in his concluding remarks that he hoped action would be taken on a problem the security force has been dealing with for six years.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1999



LABOR ISSUES AT DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SITES

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

The following concerns were raised at a session of members of labor organizations on Wednesday, May 26, 1999, in preparation for the National Stakeholder Workshop. The session was attended by about 12 people and was facilitated by Barry Lawson. Copies of these notes were to be made available to labor representatives at the beginning of the Workshop.

Overriding Goal of Labor Session

The goal of the labor session was to arrange a meeting at the May Workshop among Bob Alvarez, Bob DeGrasse and all labor representatives present at the Workshop. A meeting was scheduled with the two DOE officials at 3:00 PM on the 27th. This meeting was continued at 5:00 PM that same day.

Listed below are the issues discussed:

Section 3161

- Much of the training opportunities offered to skilled union workers is inappropriate. The workers should be given an opportunity to increase, expand, or improve their existing skills rather than be offered training for an unrelated field. A worker should have a chance to mold his/her skills to meet the needs either at the site, another DOE site, or for work offsite. One company offsite near Atlanta has taken the lead in identifying future job needs and is trying to provide skill enhancement training to fill those jobs. Skill enhancement is better than so-called retraining.
- Subcontractors in DOE facilities that have been leased through the community reuse program are not subject to section 3161 provisions--this sets up an inequity that is unfair to unions whose workers find it tough to compete with those who are not required to have as much training; the training offered at the Career Development Center at Fernald was provided as an example.
- There is too little (and in some cases, no) input from labor in preparing local section 3161 policies and these policies vary from one site to another.
- The bottom line is that DOE does not appreciate its skilled union workers. As a result, labor is often the last one to be heard and, if heard, little is done to address their concerns.



- One result of outsourcing is that there is no attempt to recycle existing union workers (e.g., Rocky Flats).
- Not only does labor input on section 3161 seem to be decreasing over time, the impression is that labor is not considered a stakeholder. This is clearly inconsistent with statements to the contrary by Secretary O'Leary. One result is that labor does not have an equal voice with other stakeholders. This is wrong.
- One problem is the lack of awareness, particularly among some labor people, on how section 3161 works and how policy is developed at each site.
- Labor is underrepresented in Community Reuse Organizations.
- Displaced workers do not get called for job interviews especially when they have taken another temporary job--out-of-sight, out-of-mind. Savannah River was offered as one example.
- A proposal: How about DOE providing \$1 million to each of 20 internationals for hands-on, skill-specific training? This could replace some of the extravagant training provided to non-union people in the complex.

Security Personnel Issues

- Qualifications for security workers are going up, and some older union labor force members cannot pass these standards.
- Opening for security people at site "B" cannot be filled by available security people at site "A" because there are no transfer clearances. This is inappropriate and can lead to unnecessary expense (e.g., New Mexico).
- Property control is losing qualified people and making it difficult to fulfill this function satisfactorily.
- It seems that nowadays almost anybody can get onsite at DOE facilities.
- Guards are not being included in labor-management meetings.

Effect of Downsizing at Kansas City Plant



- What are the mission and plans for implementing them at Kansas City?

Preferential Contracting to Disadvantaged and Minority Firms

- This continues to be an issue, especially when these firms are selected outside a competitive process (e.g., BNFL and ATI).

Consolidated Contract for Weapons Across Sites

- DOE does not appear to willing to serve as an integrator. If this is the case, why are there still so many DOE staff people at the sites?

Environmental Cleanup Standards at DOE Sites

- The cleanup standards at sites are higher than those that were in place during original construction.

Section 3162 Implementation

- Provisions for medical surveillance programs need to be initiated. There are some serious worker medical problems at some sites, and damage control is clearly called for.
- What is the role of OSHA standards and guidance? Which agency has jurisdiction, DOE or OSHA?
- Labor leaders would welcome an opportunity to meet with David Michaels, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Safety and Health, to discuss some pertinent safety and health issues.

Who Is Overseeing Training Efforts?

- Security clearance requirements continue to be an issue.
- There should be consistent rules for all workers at a site. Currently there is a double standard.



- Subcontractors working at leased DOE facilities (as tenants) are not required to have the same training as union workers laboring--often side-by-side.--This is unfair to union workers who could be doing some of this subcontracted work.

Problems With Integrated Contracts

The decisionmakers at DOE do not go onto the sites because of perceived safety concerns. This hampers their ability to make the best decisions.

- The use of performance bonuses has been costly and a nightmare in many cases. The incentive system for reducing overhead costs has often led to certain functions being cut back only to lead to the need to reinstate them at a later date. This is true even for some safety and security issues at sites (e.g., Rocky Flats, Savannah River).
- Safety concerns seem to get ignored when economic incentives are highlighted. And security inconsistencies are evident when prison labor is allowed onsite or when security checks are not mandated as they were during the full operation at the sites.
- Because of bait-and-switch strategies used by contractors in proposals, labor often loses.

University-Type Management

- The proposed addition of the University of Tennessee as a manager at Oak Ridge runs the real risk of just adding another management layer that costs money.

Department of Energy Response to Issues

At the meeting between labor representatives and Robert Alvarez, Senior Policy Advisor to Secretary Richardson, and Robert DeGrasse, Director of the Office of Worker and Community Transition, a series of responses to the issues raised were offered by the DOE officials.

The following is a list of the principal responses provided by the DOE :



- DOE is currently taking action to propose legislation to bring contract workers at DOE sites into the federal compensation/benefit system. There is a precedent for such action.
- Action is also being taken to address the increasing medical problems among workers at several sites. Beryllium is one of the medical hazards that will be addressed. DOE's position on these medical problems is that there is no need to analyze causation for these problems; let's just address them. The Department of Labor is supportive of this initiative and will be taking the lead as it has elsewhere. There will be detail on this in the next month or so.
- DOE recognizes the importance of dealing with providing continuing medical insurance coverage for workers after closure, but is currently uncertain just how this will be accomplished.
- The Department is willing to follow up with the Community Reuse Organizations (CROs) to see that efforts are made to hire displaced workers. However, DOE does not seem to have great leverage. Bob DeGrasse suggested that (1) labor representatives call him with specific cases where appropriate efforts are not being made to hire displaced workers, and (2) DOE may be able to affect change through the grant-making process with CROs. DOE is presently encouraging CRO grantees to get labor sign-off on proposals to be submitted for grants.
- DOE wants to have more direct lines of accountability between Headquarters and the sites and to establish better communication with union executives.



**APPENDIX A
FINAL PARTICIPANTS LIST**

David Abelson
Executive Director
Rocky Flats Coalition of Local Governments
5460 Ward Road
Suite 205
Arvada, CO 80002
Phone: 303-940-6090
Fax: 303-940-6088
E-mail: dableson@rfclog.org

Cheryl Abernathy
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518
Phone: 702-295-1019
Fax: 702-295-2367
E-mail: abernathy@nv.doe.gov

Sherry Adame
Manager, Human Resources
TRW Environmental Safety Systems, Inc.
1180 Town Center Drive
Las Vegas, NV 89128
Phone: 702-295-5181
Fax: 702-295-5241
E-mail: sherry_adame@ymp.gov

Bob Agonia
Program Manager, Contractor Human
Resources
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518
Phone: 702-295-1005

Fax: 702-295-2367
E-mail: agonia@nv.doe.gov

Susan Alexander
Director, Resource Management
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc.
701 Scarboro Road, MS-8240
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8240
Phone: 423-574-4022
Fax: 423-576-6034
E-mail: yeo@ornl.gov

Bob Alvarez
Senior Policy Advisor
Office of the Secretary (S-1)
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-7131
Fax:
E-mail:

Courtney Anderson
Economic Development Analyst
Council for Urban Economic Development
1730 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202-223-4735
Fax: 202-223-4745
E-mail: canderson@urbandevelopment.com

Mellody Anderson
Chicago Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
9800 South Cass Ave.
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone: 630-252-2532



Fax: 630-252-2919
E-mail: melody.anderson@ch.doe.gov

Roberto A. Archuleta
Industrial Relations Specialist
Albuquerque Operations Office
U. S. Department of Energy
P O Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185
Phone: 505-845-4222
Fax:
E-mail: rarchuleta@doeal.gov

Dean Arnold
General Attorney
U.S. Department of Energy
9800 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone: 630-252-2301
Fax: 630-252-2183
E-mail:

Marilyn Balcombe
Industrial Psychologist
Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Worker & Community Transition
(WT-1)
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-2023
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-mail: balcombm@oraogov

Bob Baney
Grants Administrator
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-063/ FORS
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585

Phone: 202-586-3751
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-mail: Robert.Baney@hq.DOE.gov

Robert J. Bardsley
Industrial Relations Officer
Idaho Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
850 Energy Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83401-1563
Phone: 208-526-0688
Fax: 208-526-5969
E-mail: bardslrj@inel.gov

Jim Bateman
Vice President
Hanford Atomic Metals Trade Council
(HAMTC)
1305 Knight Street
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-946-0326
Fax: 509-943-5245
E-mail:

Richard F. Beam
International Vice President
International Guards Union of America
Region I
210 Suntides Boulevard
Yakima, WA 98908
Phone: 509-965-2930
Fax: 509-965-2625
E-mail: goldplate@nwinform.net

Eileen L. Beaulieu
Community Manager
Albuquerque Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185
Phone: 505-845-4984



Fax: 505-845-4239
E-mail: ebeaulieu@doeal.gov

Chuck Bernhard
Manager, Oak Ridge Office
Teledyne Brown Engineering
800 Oak Ridge Turnpike
Suite A103
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone: 423-482-8040
Fax: 423-482-0940
E-mail:

Sarah Billups
Science Applications International Corporation
(SAIC)
901 D Street, SW
Suite 201
Washington, DC 20024
Phone:
Fax: 202-488-3158
E-mail:

Thomas A. Biscup
Director, Industrial Relations
Fluor Daniel Fernald, Inc.
P.O. Box 538704, MS-15
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8704
Phone: 513/648-4884
Fax: 513/648-3777
E-mail: thomas_biscup@fernald.gov

Sara Bobersky
Program Manager
StarAccess
3601 Eisenhower Avenue
Suite 450
Alexandria, VA 22304
Phone: 703-317-8373

Fax: 703-960-7007
E-mail: sbobersky@staraccess.com

Raymond J. Borkowski
Vice President
Performance Plus International, Inc.
103 A Donner Drive
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone: 423-425-0211
Fax: 423-425-0089
E-mail: rhk@icx.net

Ann Bormolini
Vice President and Director
Kaiser-Hill Company
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site
Post Office Box 464
Building 111
Golden, CO 80402-0464
Phone: 303-966-7545
Fax: 303-966-4957
E-mail: ann.bormolini@rfets.gov

Mary Ellen Boyd
Special Assistant
Building and Construction Trades Department
AFL-CIO
4th Floor
1155 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-347-1461
Fax: 202-737-1725
E-mail:

John Bradburne
President
Fluor Daniel Fernald, Inc.
P.O. Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253-8704
Phone: 513-648-3311
Fax: 513-648-3601



E-mail:

Gene Branham
Vice President
Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Fluor Daniel Fernald
P O Box 126
Ross, OH 45061
Phone: 513-648-5079
Fax: 513-648-3710
E-mail:

Susan R. Brechbill
Chief Counsel
Richland Operations Office
U S Department of Energy
P.O. Box 550, A4-52
825 Jadwin
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-7311
Fax: 509-376-4590
E-mail: Susan.R.Brechbill@RC.gov

John Brock
Labor Relations Manager
Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC
Post Office Box 4699
Highway 58 South
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7113
Phone: 423-241-1201
Fax: 423-241-1425
E-mail: brockjw@bechteljacobs.org

Lyle Brown
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-057/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0431

Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail:

Robert J. Brown, III
Assistant Manager for Assets Utilization
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 2001
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-576-2599
Fax: 423-241-4339
E-mail: browarj@oro.doe.gov

Ed Burgess
Director of Regional Office
South Carolina Department of Commerce
P O Box 927
Columbia, SC 29202
Phone: 803-737-0407
Fax: 803-737-0418
E-mail:

James B. Bussell
Program Manager
East Tennessee Mechanical Contractors, Inc.
P O Box 4247
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-574-3054
Fax: 423-241-6304
E-mail: busselljb@ornl.gov

Matt Cain
Science Applications International Corporation
(SAIC)
901 D Street SW
Suite 201
Washington, DC 20024
Phone: 202/488-6625
Fax: 202/488-3158
E-mail: thomas.m.cain@cpmx.saic.com

Bruce Campbell



Assistant to General Manager
Mason & Hanger Corporation - Pantex
701 North Taylor Street
Nations Bank Building, Suite 420
Amarillo, TX 79101
Phone: 806-372-4662
Fax: 806-372-4663
E-mail: bcampbel@pantex.com

Tim Carlson
President and CEO
NTS Development Corporation
2340 Paseo del Prado, Suite D-108
Las Vegas, NV 89102
Phone: 702-257-7900
Fax: 702-257-7999
E-mail: tcarlson@ntsdev.com

Margaret Carroll
Industrial Relations Specialist
HRMD-IR
U.S. Department of Energy
1301 Clay Street
700N
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510-637-1892
Fax: 510-637-2008
E-mail: margaret.carroll@oak.doe.gov

Tony Carter
Special Assistant
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-041/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-3323
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-mail: tony.carter@hq.doe.gov

William M. Castoro
Chairman
Community Reuse Organization
Pinellas Star Center
7887 Bryan Dairy Road
Suite 150
Largo, FL 33777
Phone: 727-541-8080
Fax: 727-545-8585
E-mail: kmitchel@co.pinellas.fl.us

Thomas Cauthen
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box A
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-8044
Fax: 803-725-8573
E-mail: Thomas04.cauthen@srs.gov

Chee Chang
Program Manager
International Brotherhood of Teamsters Union
25 Louisiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
Phone: 202-624-6963
Fax: 202-624-8125
E-mail: chee328@aol.com

Michael Church
President
Paper, Allied Industrial, Chemical, Energy
Workers International Union (PACE)
Local 5-288
P.O. Box 4936
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-4936
Phone: 423-483-3745
Fax: 423-483-6460
E-mail: pace@icx.net



John H. Clabaugh
Manager, Human Resources
AlliedSignal Inc. FM&T
P.O. Box 419159
Kansas City, MO 64141-6159
Phone: 816-997-5575
Fax: 816-997-7016
E-mail: jclabaugh@kcp.com

Michael J. Cleghorn
President
National Council of Security Inspectors
(NCSI)
705 Glen Abbey Circle
Las Vegas, NV 89107
Phone: 702-259-4410
Fax: 702-259-0010
E-mail:

Herbert L. Coleman
President
United Plant Guard Workers Association
Local 330
2291 Busswood Drive
August, GA 30906
Phone: 803-952-3365
Fax: 803-471-9592
E-mail:

Ben D. Corder
Director, Industrial Relations
Flour Daniel Hanford
Box 1000
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-5205
Fax: 509-376-8697
E-mail:

Mike Dabbert
Resource Management Specialist
Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant

U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 700
Piketon, OH 45661
Phone: 740-897-5525
Fax: 740-897-2982
E-mail: dabbertmj@ornl.gov

Sandy Davis
Labor Relations Manager
Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC
Highway 58 South, P.O. Box 4699
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7113
Phone: 423-574-8585
Fax: 423-241-1425
E-mail: davissj1@bechteljacobs.org

Vicky L. Davis
Management Analyst, Public Affairs &
Information Office
Nevada Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 98518
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8518
Phone: 702-295-2770
Fax: 702-295-1810
E-mail: davis@nv.doe.gov

Robert W. DeGrasse, Jr.
Director
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-030/ FORS
1000 Independence Avenue
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-7550
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail: robert.degrasse@hq.doe.gov

Thomas B. DePriest
Attorney-Advisor
Office of General Counsel



U.S. Department of Energy
(GC-51)
Room 6A-113/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-2946
Fax: 202-586-7373
E-mail: Thomas.Depriest@hq.doe.gov

Pam DeRensis
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-6751
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail:

G. Leah Dever
Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Ohio Field Office
1 Mound Road
P.O. Box 3020
Miamisburg, OH 45458
Phone: 937-865-3977
Fax: 937-865-3426
E-mail: Lorinda.LeDuc@Ohio.DOE.GOV

Sheila Dillard
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1), 6F-029/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202/586-1311
Fax: 202/586-1737
E-mail: shelia.dillard@hq.doe.gov

Lou Doll
Cincinnati Building Trades Representative at
Fernald
Building Trades

Fluor Daniel Fernald
P O Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45253
Phone: 513-648-3723
Fax: 513-648-3723
E-mail: Lou.Doll@Fernald.gov

Dana J. Dorr
Employee Relations Manager
Kaiser-Hill Company, L.L.C.
Rocky Flats Environmental Technology Site
P.O. Box 464, Bldg. 452
Golden, CO 80402-0464
Phone: 303-966-7978
Fax: 303-966-4991
E-mail: Dana.Dorr@RFETS.gov

John Driskill
President
United Plant Guard Workers of America
Local 111
767 Dry Bridge Road
Smithland, KY 42081
Phone: 270-928-2621 Fax: 270-441-6704
E-mail: puradd@apex.net

Clyde M. Elrod
Vice Chairman
PACRO
P.O. Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066-0588
Phone: 507-247-7171
Fax: 502-251-6110
E-mail:

Charlie Emery
Vice President, Human Resources
Sandia National Laboratories
P O Box 5800, MS 0186
Albuquerque, NM 87158-0186
Phone: 505-845-7692



Fax: 505-844-5238
E-mail: cemery@sandia.gov

Cecelia A. Evans
Vice President
Star Access/Star Mountain, Inc
3601 Eisenhower Avenue
Suite 450
Alexandria, VA 22304-6425
Phone: 703-317-0336
Fax: 703-960-7009
E-mail: cevans@staraccess.com

Sam Ferraro
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1), 6F-029/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5057
Fax: 202-586-1737
E-mail:

Timothy P. Fischer
Attorney-Advisor
U.S. Department of Energy
Savannah River Site, Office of Chief Counsel
P.O. Box A
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-1022
Fax: 803-725-7544
E-mail:

Tim Fischer
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
SRF-5J
77 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: 312-886-5787
Fax: 312-353-8426
E-mail:

Clara Foster
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1), Room 6F-023/FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5881
Fax: 202-586-1737
E-mail: clara.foster@hq.doe.gov

Terry Freese
Deputy Director
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-030/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5907
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail:

James P. Fuerstenberg
Counsel

U.S. Department of Energy
Chicago Operations Office
9800 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone: 630-252-2043
Fax: 630-252-2183
E-mail:

David R. Fuller
President
Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers
International Union, Local 3-550
2525 Old Cairo Road
Paducah, KY 42001
Phone: 502-441-5967
Fax:
E-mail:

Chip Gagne



Programmer
SAIC
20201 Century Blvd., Suite 300
Germantown, MD 20855
Phone: 301-353-1874
Fax: 301-428-1973
E-mail: gagnere@saic.com

Jon Gahn
President
United Plant Guard Workers of America
Local 66
P.O. Box 1020
Mail Stop 4025
Piketon, OH 45661
Phone: 740-897-2331
Fax: 740-897-2146
E-mail:

Anthony B. Gallegos
Senior Management Advisor
Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and
Technology
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0505
Fax: 202-586-8353
E-mail: anthony.gallegos@hq.doe.gov

Richard W. Garretson, Jr.
Representative
Pacific Northwest Regional Council of
Carpenters
Local Union 2403, United Brotherhood of
Carpenters
335 Skagit
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-375-3576

Fax: 509-375-4221
E-mail: Rich2452@AOL.COM

Virginia Geer
GM Co-Director
UAW/GM Center for Human Resources
Region 8
4484 Covington Highway
Suite 102
Decatur, GA 30035
Phone: 404-286-0838
Fax: 404-289-7129
E-mail:

Michael H. Gibson
Vice President
OCAW Union, Local 7-4200
1 Mound Road
P O Box 3030
Miamisburg, OH 45343
Phone: 937-865-4658
Fax: 937-865-4075
E-mail: Gibsmh@doe-md.gov

Ed Gilliland
Director of Advisory Services
Council for Urban Economic Development
(CUED)
1730 K Street NW
#700
Washington, DC 20006
Phone: 202/223-4735
Fax: 202/223-4745
E-mail:

William Gilyard, III
Contractor Human Resources Team Leader
Savannah River Operations Office
U S Department of Energy
P O Box A
Attn: AMBL/CMD/CHR



Aiken, SC 29802-0900
Phone: 803-725-1544
Fax: 803-725-0448
E-mail: william.gilyard@srs.gov

Greg J. Glynn
Manager
Labor Relations
Bechtel Nevada Corporation
P.O. Box 98521, MS- NLV021
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8521
Phone: 702-295-0173
Fax: 702-295-2908/3222
E-mail: glynnj@nv.doe.gov

Patti Goin
Manager
Office of Human Resources
Bechtel Nevada
P O Box 98521
M/S NLV009
Las Vegas, NV 89193-8521
Phone: 702-295-2294
Fax: 702-295-2448
E-mail: goinpi@nv.doe.gov

Mike J. Grauwelman
President
Miamisburg Mound Community
Improvement Corporation
P.O. Box 232
Miamisburg, OH 45343-0232
Phone: 937-865-4462
Fax: 937-865-4431
E-mail: mmcic@aol.com

Ann Gustavson
Manager, Human Resources & Labor
Relations
Wakenhut Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 96027

Las Vegas, NE 89193
Phone: 702-295-0811
Fax: 702-295-2445
E-mail: gustavson@NV.DOE.gov

Jerry Hall
Hazardous Material Specialist
Sheet Metal Workers International
1321 Homestead Court
Roseville, CA 95661
Phone: 916-786-7513
Fax: 916-786-7595
E-mail:

James Hall
Manager
U S Department of Energy
Oak Ridge Operations Office
20 Administration Road
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-576-4444
Fax: 423-576-0006
E-mail:

Jim H. Hanna
Director
Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.
P.O. Box 1000, H8-24
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-8229
Fax: 509-376-8697
E-mail: james_h_hanna@rl.gov

Jerry M. Harden
President
United Steelworkers of America
Local Union 8031
P O Box 745370
Aravada, CO 80006-5370
Phone: 303-966-2798
Fax: 303-966-4317



E-mail:

Jenny A. Heckler
Workforce Restructuring Manager
Fluor Daniel Fernald
175 Tri-County Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45246
Phone: 513-648-6227
Fax: 513-648-6905
E-mail: Jenny_Heckler@Fernald.gov

Kenneth E. Hedman
Vice President and Manager - Labor Relations
Bechtel Construction Company
50 Beale Street (7 C-112)
San Francisco, CA 94105-1895
Phone: 415-768-6282
Fax: 415-768-1883
E-mail: kehedman@bechtel.com

James Hendricks
Vice President
PACE Union Local 5-288
International Union, Local 3-288
P.O. Box 4936
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-483-3745
Fax: 423-483-6460
E-mail: pace@icx.net

Martin Hewitt
Chief Steward
United Plant Guard Workers of America
Local 330
P O Box W
Aiken, SC 29802-0990
Phone: 706-790-1263
Fax: 803-471-3332
E-mail: southsides57@msn.com

David L. Hickey

International Secretary/Treasurer
UPGWA
25510 Kelly Road
Roseville, MI 48066
Phone: 810-772-7250
Fax: 810-772-9644
E-mail: DLHickey@aol.com

Henry Hodges
Treasurer
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
P.O. Box 588
Mayfield, KY 42066
Phone: 270-247-7171
Fax: 270-252-6110
E-mail: henry.hodges@mail.state.ky.us

Robert Hoover
President
University of Idaho
Administration Building
Room 105
Moscow, ID 83844-3151
Phone: 208-885-6365
Fax: 208-885-6558
E-mail: hoover@uidaho.edu

Darryl Howe
Manager, Employee Relations, HR 201
Argonne National Laboratory
9700 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439-4803
Phone: 630-252-3434
Fax: 630-252-3014
E-mail: dhowe@anl.gov

Walter S. Howes
Director
Contract Reform and Privatization Project
Office (PC-1)
Room 6F-055/FORS



U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0800
Fax: 202-586-1025
E-mail:

Henry Huffman
Project Director
Operations Management International, Inc.
2010 Highway 58
Suite 4101
Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone: 423-241-0727
Fax: 423-241-0734
E-mail: hhuffman@ch2m.com

James Jackson
Manager
Human Resources/Labor/Training and
Admin.Services
Babcock and Wilcox of Ohio
1 Mound Avenue
Miamisburg, OH 45343-3030
Phone: 937-865-5584
Fax: 937-865-3099
E-mail: jackjel@doe-md.gov

Sheria Johnson
HR Associate
Oak Ridge National Laboratory
P.O. Box 2008
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-241-1704
Fax: 423-241-1704
E-mail: wnt@ornl.gov

Gary Jones
Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
(ORISE)
U.S. Department of Energy

Room 6G-069/FORS (WT-1)
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0473
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-mail:

Robert Kaneshiro
President
International Association of Machinists and
Aerospace Workers
76 Pageant Street
Belen, NM 87002
Phone: 505-844-7081
Fax: 505-844-8727
E-mail: rhkane@sandia.gov

Almira Kennedy
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
WT-1, Room 6G-030
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-7783
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail:

Jim H. Key
Safety & Health Representative
Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical & Energy
Workers International Union
P O Box 9503
Paducah, KY 42002
Phone: 502-441-6576
Fax: 502-441-6024
E-mail: njnkey@hcis.net

Mike Keyes
President
International Guards Union of America
Local Union No. 14
P O Box 538704
MS-22



Cincinnati, OH 45253-8704
Phone: 513-648-5614
Fax: 513-648-3601
E-mail:

Seth Kirshenberg
Executive Director
Energy Communities Alliance
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-828-2317
Fax: 202-828-2488
E-mail: sethk@energyca.org

Richard Kiy
Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary
Office of Environment, Safety and Health
Room 7A-097
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0307
Fax: 202-586-6010
E-mail: richard.kiy@eh.doe.gov

Art Kleinrath
Miamisburg Environmental Management
Project
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 66
Miamisburg, OH 45353-0232
Phone: 937-865-3597
Fax: 937-865-4219
E-mail:

Brent Knowles
Human Resources Specialist
Mason & Hanger Corporation
Bldg. 16-12
P O Box 30020

Amarillo, TX 79120-0020
Phone: 806-477-5860
Fax: 806-477-7806
E-mail: bknowles@pantex.com

Roy Korkalo
President
Livingston Rebuild Center Northwest, Inc.
Post Office Box 992
Livingston, MT 59047
Phone: 406-222-4208
Fax: 406-222-7679
E-mail: rkorkalo@lrcx.com

Jeanette Langford
Staffing Manager
United States Enrichment Corp. (USEC)
Post Office Box 628
Piketon, OH 45661
Phone: 740-897-4542
Fax: 740-897-2984
E-mail: langfordj@ports.usec.com

Barry R. Lawson
President
Barry Lawson Associates
Old Cemetery Road
P O Box 26
Peacham, VT 05862-0026
Phone: 802-592-3949
Fax: 802-592-3950
E-mail: lawson@helicon.net

David A. Lester
Director
Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education
Post Office Box 117
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-576-3304
Fax: 423-576-3646
E-mail: lester@orav.gov



David A. Lewis
Research Associate
Rutgers University
33 Livingston Avenue, Suite 500
New Brunswick, NJ 08901
Phone: 732-932-4587
Fax: 732-932-4591
E-mail: dalewis@eden.rutgers.edu

Sheila K. Little
Vice President
Business and Community Affairs
Fluor Daniel Hanford, Inc.
Post Office Box 1000
H8-63
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-9315
Fax: 509-372-2454
E-mail: sheila_k_little@rl.gov

Victor D. Lovato
Chief Steward
Metal Trades Council
1030 San Pedro N E
Albuquerque, NM 87110
Phone: 505-268-3242
Fax: 505-265-7394
E-mail:

Carol Lyons
Rocky Flats Coordinator
City of Arvada
Post Office Box 8101
Arvada, CO 80001-8101
Phone: 303-421-2550
Fax: 303-431-3911
E-mail: CLyons@ci.Arvida.CO.US

Ed Manning
Construction Manager, Operations and
Services

Bechtel Savannah River, Inc.
Building 704-N
Aiken, SC 29808
Phone: 803-557-4084
Fax: 803-557-4704
E-mail: edward.manning@srs.gov

Patricia J. Marx
Chief Operating Officer
Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute
Post Office Box 5890
Albuquerque, NM 87108
Phone: 505-845-1075
Fax: 505-845-1198
E-mail: aryburn@lrri.org

John J. McAuliffe
Project Manager, Labor Relations
Sandia National Laboratories
MS 1025
P O Box 5800
Albuquerque, NM 87185-1025
Phone: 505-844-9260
Fax: 505-844-8816
E-mail: jjmcaul@sandia.gov

Eugene P. McConville
International President
International Union, United Plant Guard
Workers of America
25510 Kelly Road
Roseville, MI 48066
Phone: 810-772-7250
Fax: 810-772-9644
E-mail:

Joyce L. McDonald
Staffing Manager
Lockheed Martin Idaho Technologies
Company
P O Box 1625



Idaho Falls, ID 83415-3127
Phone: 208-526-2070
Fax: 208-526-0025
E-mail: mlj@inel.gov

Neal McGregor
Security Officer (President, UPGWA, Local #251)
AlliedSignal Inc. FM&T
Department D/132, BQ51
P O Box 419159
Kansas City, MO 64141-6159
Phone: 816-997-3601
Fax: 816-997-7281
E-mail:

Ed Mee
Vice President
Atomic Trades and Labor Council
P.O. Box 2008
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-574-4137
Fax: 423-574-6673
E-mail: mee@ornl.gov

John F. Meese
President
Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO
AFL-CIO Building
1925 K Street, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006-4189
Phone: 202-293-3812
Fax: 202-293-4287
E-mail:

John T. Merwin
Workforce Restructuring Manager
Fluor Daniel Fernald
P.O. Box 538704
Cincinnati, OH 45013-9402
Phone: 513-648-6442

Fax: 513-648-6905
E-mail: john_merwin@fernald.gov

Lynn L. Miller
Senior Labor Attorney
Argonne National Laboratory
9700 S. Cass Avenue
OTD/Legal 201
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone: 630-252-3041
Fax: 630-252-5366
E-mail: LLMiller@anl.gov

Richard Miller
Policy Analyst
Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers
International Union
2090 Northampton Street
Holyoke, MA 01040
Phone: 202-637-0400
Fax: 202-637-2977
E-mail: rickyudana@aol.com

Margot Mininni
Senior Advisor
Nuclear Cities Initiative
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-8690
Fax: 202-586-6124
E-mail:

Jack Monrean
Manager, Labor Relations
Bechtel Hanford, Inc.
3350 George Washington Way, MSIN H0-08
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-375-4683
Fax: 509-372-9417



E-mail: jrmonrea@bhi-erc.com

Richard E. Nash
Executive & Finance Committee Member
Paducah Area Community Reuse Organization
P.O. Box 36
Calvert City, KY 42029
Phone: 270-395-7138
Fax: 270-395-5554
E-mail:

David M. Navarro
Vice President
United Steelworkers of America
Local Union 8031
7850 Yates Street
Westminster, CO 80030
Phone: 303-966-6871
Fax: 303-427-3382
E-mail: DavNavarro@aol.com

Brian Nickel
Project Manager
Environmental Protection Agency - Ohio
401 East Fifth Street
Dayton, OH 45402
Phone: 937-285-6468
Fax: 937-285-6404
E-mail:

Patrick Noone
Management Analyst
EM-73
U. S. Department of Energy
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874-1290
Phone: 301-903-2870
Fax: 301-903-2202
E-mail: noone@em.doe.gov

Robert V. Nord

Subcontract Labor Relations Manager
Bechtel Savannah River, Inc. (BSRI)
704-N Aiken, SC 29808
Aiken, SC 29808
Phone: 706-855-0092
Fax: 803-557-4319
E-mail: robert.nord@srs.gov

Melanie Norton
Account Executive
Magellan Behavioral Health
320 North Cedar Bluff Road
Suite 330
Knoxville, TN 37923
Phone: 423/690-0068
Fax: 423/690-0257
E-mail: msnorton@compuserve.com

Patty Parizzi
Office of Worker and Community Transition
(WT-1) Room 6G-030/ FORS
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-7550
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail:

Eric Isaiah Parker
Committeeman
PACE
5007 Ballard Drive
Dayton, OH 45418
Phone: 937-263-1470
Fax:
E-mail: PARKER@DOE-MD.GOV

Dennis Pennington
Union - PACE
Operations Management International, Inc.
2010 Highway 58
Suite 4101



Oak Ridge, TN 37830
Phone: 423-241-0729
Fax: 423-241-0734
E-mail:

Robert C. Perko
Labor Relations Manager
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
P O Box 808, MS L-708
Livermore, CA 94550
Phone: 510-422-9501
Fax: 510-423-5665
E-mail: perko@llnl.gov

Lester (Tony) A. Perry
Director of Business Development
ORAU/ORISE
P.O. Box 117
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-0117
Phone: 423-576-3304
Fax: 423-576-3643
E-mail:

Clayton L. Plemmons
International Representative
Laborers International Union of
North America
5845 Live Oak Parkway, Suite B-1
Norcross, GA 30093-1738
Phone: 770-446-1502
Fax: 770-446-6970
E-mail:

Steven L. Porter
Manager, Legal Department
Battelle - Pacific Northwest National
Laboratory
P.O. Box 999, K1-67
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-4131
Fax: 509-375-2592

E-mail: sl_porter@pnl.gov

Herman Potter
Safety Representative
PACE/OCAW
Local 5-689
P.O. Box 467
Piketon, OH 45661
Phone: 740-289-2405
Fax: 740-289-2126
E-mail: PACEPORT@ZOOMNET.NET

Barbara Powers
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Rocky Flats Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
10808 Highway 93, Unit A
Golden, CO 80403-8200
Phone: 303-966-3317
Fax: 303-966-7447
E-mail: barbara.powers@rfets.gov

Geoffrey Quinn
Field Coordinator
Northern California Teamsters
Apprenticeship Training
Post Office Box 1404
Rancho Murieta, CA 95683
Phone: 916-354-2122
Fax: 919-354-2234
E-mail:

John L. Rice
Director, Human Resources
Allied Singal FM&T
Federal Manufacturing & Technologies
P.O. Box 419159
Kansas City, MO 64141
Phone: 816-997-3251
Fax: 816-997-7016
E-mail: jrice@kcp.com



Harry A. Richardson
Laborers' International Union of N.A.
Local 265
3457 Montgomery Road
Cincinnati, OH 45207
Phone: 513-221-5260
Fax: 513-221-5573
E-mail:

Thomas P. Richardson
Industrial Relations Specialist
U.S. Department of Energy
Oak Ridge Operations Office, AD-441
200 Administration Road
P.O. Box 2001
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8791
Phone: 423-576-0663
Fax: 423-576-6964
E-mail: RichardsonTP@ORO.DOE.GOV

Teresa Riggs
Benefits Administration Manager
Bechtel Jacobs Company LLC
Post Office Box 4699
Highway 58, Gallaher Road
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-7298
Phone: 423-241-1351
Fax: 423-241-0214
E-mail: riggsth@bechteljacobs.org

Bart Roberts
SPO - Vice President
IGAN
8736 Potonza
Las Vegas, NV
Phone: 702-252-9256
Fax:
E-mail:

Mike M. Robinson
Manager, Employee Relations Department

Wackenhut Services Inc
Savannah River Site
P O Box W, MS 708-1B
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-952-7600
Fax: 803-952-9042
E-mail:

Marty Ross
Committeeman
PACE International Union
Post Office Box 467
Piketon, OH 45661
Phone: 740-289-2405
Fax: 740-289-2405
E-mail: PACEPORT@ZOOMNET.NET

Mell Roy
Chief Counsel
Rocky Flats Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 926 / B460
Golden, CO 80402-0928
Phone: 303-966-2026
Fax: 303-966-3717
E-mail: mell.roy@rfets.gov

Sharon D. Ruehl
Manager, Contractor Workforce Programs
U.S. Department of Energy
Richland Operations Office
Post Office Box 550, A6-3L
825 Jadwin, Room 605B
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-376-7221
Fax: 509-376-8142
E-mail: sharon_d_ruehl@rl.gov

Gloria Ruiz
Industrial Relations Assistant
Albuquerque Operations Office



U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87185
Phone: 505-845-6668
Fax: 505-845-4715
E-mail: gruiz@doeal.gov

Daniel J. Saiz
Industrial Relations Specialist
U.S. Department of Energy
Albuquerque Operations Office
Post Office Box 5400
Albuquerque, NM 87116
Phone: 505-845-5340
Fax: 505-845-4715
E-mail: dsaiz@doeal.gov

Elmer Salazar
Project Leader
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Mail Stop C333
Los Alamos, NM 87545
Phone: 505-667-5720
Fax: 505-665-3125
E-mail: elmers@lanl.gov

Robert L. San Martin
Manager
U.S. Department of Energy
Chicago Operations Office
9800 South Cass Avenue
Argonne, IL 60439
Phone: 630-252-2110
Fax: 630-252-9473
E-mail:

Toni M. Sawyer
Human Resources Specialist
West Valley Nuclear Services Co., Inc.
10282 Rock Springs Road
P.O. Box 191

West Valley, NY 14171-0191
Phone: 716-942-4949
Fax: 716-942-4096
E-mail: sawyert@wv.doe.gov

Carl (Bubba) Scarbrough
President
Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc
P.O. Box 4068
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-4068
Phone: 423-574-8434
Fax: 423-576-7082
E-mail: cls@ornl.gov

Tom Schaffer
President
Hanford Atomic Metal Trades Council
(HAMTC)
P.O. Box 898
Richland, WA 99352-2187
Phone: 509-373-0326
Fax: 509-943-5245
E-mail:

Bill Sena
Vice President, Metal Trades Council, AFL-
CIO
Atomic Projects and Production workers
1030 San Pedro NE
Albuquerque, NM 87110
Phone: 505-268-3242
Fax: 505-266-4430
E-mail:

Roger Shomers
State Director
Rocky Mountain Regional Council of
Carpenters
5155 E 39th Avenue
Denver, CO 80207-1108



Phone: 303-355-8774
Fax: 303-355-1092
E-mail:

Russ Showers
Security Specialist
Policy, Standards and Analysis Division
U.S. Department of Energy
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874
Phone: 301-903-5122
Fax: 301-903-8853
E-mail:

Bernadine Sikorski
Human Resources Director
National Renewable Energy Laboratory
1617 Cole Blvd.
Building 27
Golden, CO 80401
Phone: 303-384-7581
Fax: 303-384-7599
E-mail: bernie_sikorski@nrel.gov

Cherie Smith
HR Specialist
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
Post Office Box 1000, HG2-16
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-8231
Fax: 509-372-1010
E-mail: Cherie_H_Smith@rl.gov

Laurel Smith
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6F-029/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-4091
Fax: 202-586-1540

E-mail: laurel.smith@hq.doe.gov

Randy Staudacher
Director
Office of Economic Transition
Fluor Daniel Hanford
P.O. Box 1000, H8-64
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-2360
Fax: 509-378-2454
E-mail: randall_j_staudacher@rl.gov

Vickie Stephens
Union Steward
IAMAW
AlliedSignal Federal Management &
Technologies
Post Office Box 419159
Kansas City, MO 64141-6159
Phone: 816-997-4077
Fax: 816-997-7016
E-mail: vstephens@kcp.com

Steve Stoner
Partner
Arthur Andersen
33 West Monroe
Chicago, IL 60603
Phone: 312-507-4480
Fax: 312-507-5311
E-mail:

Lowell "Pete" Strader
International Representative - Legislative
Department
PACE International Union
2722 Merrilee Dirve, Suite 250
Fairfax, VA 22031
Phone: 703-876-9300
Fax: 703-876-8952
E-mail: pacepetes@aol.com



Linda H. Strickland
Labor Relations Manager
Bechtel Savannah River, Inc.
(BSRI)
SRS704-N R-62
Aiken, SC 29801
Phone: 803-557-5395
Fax: 803-557-4707
E-mail: linda.strickland@srs.gov

Jean Stucky
Attorney-Advisor
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Department of Energy
GC-51/ Room 6A-113
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-6947
Fax: 202-586-7373
E-mail:

Stanley R. Sulak
Director for Performance Audits and
Administration
Inspector General, IG-33
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-1801
Fax: 202-586-0099
E-mail: Stanley.Sulak@hq.doe.gov

Deborah Sullivan
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-059/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0452
Fax: 202-586-1540
E-mail: deborah.sullivan@hq.doe.gov

Deborah H. Sumner
Skills Campus Manager
Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc
P O Box 2009, MS - 8091 Bld. 9737
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8084
Phone: 423-241-3111
Fax: 423-241-3113
E-mail: sumnerdh@ornl.gov

Deborah Swichkow
Deputy Director
Office of Worker and Community Transition
U.S. Department of Energy
(WT-1) Room 6G-030/ FORS
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-0876
Fax: 202-586-8403
E-mail: deborah.swichkow@hq.doe.gov

Robert G. Tabor
Trustee
Fernald Community Reuse Organization
214 Citation Circle
Harrison, OH 45030
Phone: 513-648-5077
Fax: 513-648-5527
E-mail: robert.tabor@fernald.gov

Sue Taylor Barfield
Director, SCC Metro Center
Shawnee Community College
1003 Catherine Street
Metropolis, IL 62960
Phone: 618-524-3003
Fax: 618-524-3004
E-mail: sueb@shawnee.cc.il.us

Ken Tindall
Acting Chief, Remedial Response Branch 1
Federal Facilities Section



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,
Region 5
77 West Jackson Blvd.
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: 312-886-9895
Fax: 312-353-5541
E-mail:

Terry Tracy
General Engineer
Office of Environmental Management
(EM-73)
U.S. Department of Energy
Room 1018/ Cloverleaf
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874-1290
Phone: 301-903-2173
Fax: 301-903-2202
E-mail: terrance.tracy@em.doe.gov

William A. Truex
Group Leader, Industrial Personnel Group
Oak Ridge Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 2001, M/S - AD 441
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-8791
Phone: 423-576-0662
Fax: 423-576-6964
E-mail: truexwa@oro.doe.gov

Patricia Tucker
President
Joint Utilization Commission of Grand
Junction, CO
518 28 Road Suite A207
Grand Junction, CO 81501
Phone: 970-243-1242
Fax: 970-243-1379
E-mail: ptucker@gjct.net

Kay Van Vreede

Head of Laboratory Services
Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory
University Research Association, Inc.
P.O. Box 500
Batavia, IL 60510
Phone: 630-840-3396
Fax: 630-840-2306
E-mail: vanvreede@fnal.gov

Scott VanLente
Attorney
Idaho Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
850 Energy Drive
Idaho Falls, ID 83401
Phone: 208-526-0026
Fax: 208-526-7632
E-mail:

Oba Vincent
Deputy Director
Miamisburg Environmental Management
Project
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 66
Miamisburg, OH 45353-0232
Phone: 937-865-3278
Fax: 937-865-4489
E-mail:

Jay Vivari
Public Affairs Specialist
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental
Affairs, (CI-10)
U.S. Department of Energy
Room 8G-048/ FORS
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-5143
Fax: 202-586-0539
E-mail: jay.vivari@hq.doe.gov



Cathy Wallace
Workforce Restructuring Coordinator
Fluor Daniel Fernald
175 Tri-County Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45246
Phone: 513-648-6269
Fax: 513-648-6905
E-mail: Cathy_Wallace@Fernald.gov

Gerald D. Watson
Personnel Relations Dept. Superintendent
Lockheed Martin Energy Research Corp
P.O. Box 2008
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-574-4401
Fax: 423-241-1807
E-mail: gyn@ornl.gov

Jim Watts
President
Paper, Allied Industrial, Chemical, Energy
Workers International Union (PACE)
Local 8-369
Post Office Box 524
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-943-8441
Fax: 509-943-8443
E-mail: OCAW1369@Prodigy.net

Stephanie F. Weakley
Team Leader, Contractor Human Resource
Management
Office of Procurement and Assistance
Management, MA-53
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20585
Phone: 202-586-4156
Fax: 202-586-9016
E-mail: Stephanie.Weakley@hq.doe.gov

Brian Weber
Manager, Labor Relations
Wackenhut Services Inc.
Savannah River Site
P.O. Drawer W
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-952-7997
Fax: 803-952-9042
E-mail: b.weber@srs.gov

Howard A. Weitzman
National RE/sources
485 West Putnam Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830
Phone: 203-661-0055
Fax: 203-661-8071
E-mail:

Steve West
General Manager, Environmental Service
Group
ADF Corporation
1020 Commerce Park Drive
Suite K
Oak Ridge, TN
Phone: 423-483-0963
Fax: 423-483-4591
E-mail: swest@adfcorp.com

Dorothy Whitt
Director, Personnel Division
Pittsburgh Naval Reactors Office
U S Department of Energy
P O Box 109
West Mifflin, PA 15122-0109
Phone: 412-476-7206
Fax: 412-476-7310
E-mail: whittdl@bettis.gov

Jerry Wienberg
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist



Kansas City Area Office
U S Department of Energy
P O Box 410202
Kansas City, MO 64141-0202
Phone: 816-997-3912
Fax: 816-997-5059
E-mail: jwienberg@kcp.com

Joe W. Wiley
Director, Management and Economic
Transition
Richland Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P O Box 550
Richland, WA 99352
Phone: 509-372-4005
Fax: 509-372-4549
E-mail: joe_w_wiley@rl.gov

Clark D. Wilkinson
Senior Finance and Administration Director
MK-Ferguson of Oak Ridge Company
P.O. Box 2011
Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Phone: 423-574-2840
Fax: 423-574-2844
E-mail: wilkinsoncd@ornl.gov

Martin Willhite
Project Manager
Mason and Hanger Corporation
Pantex Plant
P.O. Box 30020
Amarillo, TX 79120-0020
Phone: 806-477-3712
Fax: 806-477-5447
E-mail: mwillhit@pantex.com

Charles F. Williams
President
United Plant Guard Workers of America

Local 146
Babcox and Wilcox of Ohio
321 Whispering Drive
Trotwood, OH 45426
Phone: 937-865-3118
Fax: 937-865-4683
E-mail:

Gwendolyn W. Williams
Manager, Internal Reassignment
Westinghouse Savannah River Co.
P.O. Box 616, Bldg. 730-1B
Aiken, SC 29808
Phone: 803-952-9467
Fax: 803-952-9583
E-mail:

Mary G. Wilson
President
Transitions to Tomorrow, Inc.
6605 Uptown Boulevard NE, Suite 390
Albuquerque, NM 87110
Phone: 505-878-0430
Fax: 505-889-8086
E-mail: T3wilson@aol.com

Carol J. Wilson
Contractor Industrial Relations Specialist
Ohio Field Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box 3020
Miamisburg, OH 45343-3020
Phone: 937-865-3871
Fax: 937-865-3843
E-mail: carol.wilson@ohio.doe.gov

Jim Worthington
Nuclear and Hazardous Materials Specialist
Sheet Metal Workers' International
Association
30330 80th Avenue N W



Stanwood, WA 98292
Phone: 360-629-4348
Fax: 360-629-4086
E-mail:

Samuel Wyse
Contractor Human Resources Branch
Savannah River Operations Office
U.S. Department of Energy
P.O. Box A
Aiken, SC 29802
Phone: 803-725-1647
Fax: 803-725-8573
E-mail: samuel.wyse@srs.gov

Lawrence T. Young
President
Community Reuse Organization of East
Tennessee
107 Lea Way
P.O. Box 2110
Oak Ridge, TN 37831-2110
Phone: 423-482-1336
Fax: 423-482-6126
E-mail: younglt@oro.doe.gov

**APPENDIX B****AGENDA
U. S. Department of Energy
Office of Worker and Community Transition
NATIONAL STAKEHOLDER'S WORKSHOP
Chicago Marriott Downtown
Chicago, Illinois****WEDNESDAY, MAY 26, 1999**

10:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Exhibit Registration	Foyer, 5th Floor
2:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Workshop Registration	Foyer, 5th Floor

Related Meetings

8:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Community Reuse Organizations	Los Angeles Room 5th Floor
8:00 - 3:00 p.m.	DOE Industrial Relations Branch Chiefs	Miami Room, 5th Floor
1:00 - 5:00 p.m.	Labor Organizations	Salon C, 5th Floor
3:00 - 5:00 p.m.	DOE Employee Session	Salon F - H, 5th Floor

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1999

7:00 - 8:00 a.m.	Exhibit Registration and Set-up	Foyer, 7th Floor
7:30 - 8:30 a.m.	Workshop Registration	Foyer, 7th Floor
8:30 - 10:00 a.m.	Plenary Sessions	
8:30 - 8:45 a.m.	<i>Welcome and Introductions</i> Speaker: Robert San Martin, Manager, Chicago Operations Office	Salon II, 7th Floor
8:45 - 10:00 a.m.	<i>Reuse and Conversion</i> Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates Speakers: Howard Weitzman, National RE/sources Jim Hall, Oak Ridge Operations Office Ken Tindall, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Richard Kiy, Office of Environment, Safety and Health	Salon II, 7th Floor



This plenary session will discuss the various approaches and identify emerging issues associated with the Department's reindustrialization activities at Mound, Hanford and Oak Ridge. Reuse and conversion challenges faced by the Environmental Protection Agency and the private sector will also be discussed.

10:00 - 10:30 a.m.

Break

10:30 - 12:00 noon

Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 1

1A. ***Leasing Process*** **Salon II, 7th Floor**

Moderator: Deborah Swichkow, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Speakers: Tim Fischer, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Brian Nickel, Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
Art Kleinrath, Miamisburg Environmental Management Project
Terry Tracy, Office of Environmental Management
Oba Vincent, Miamisburg Environmental Management Project
Mike Church, Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers

This session will discuss the critical steps for successful DOE leasing including the roles and responsibilities of the field office, the relationships between the field and headquarters, the State, OSHA, and EPA, and involvement by members of the public.

1B. ***Understanding Business Location Decisions*** **Salon F-H, 5th Floor**

Moderator: Bob Baney, Office of Worker and Community Transition

Speakers: Steve Stoner, Arthur Andersen
Roy Korkalo, Livingston Rebuild Center
Ed Burgess, South Carolina Department of Commerce
Jim Watts, Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers

This session will discuss the elements of business relocation decisions. Representatives from public, private and labor sectors will provide their perspectives.

12:00 - 1:15 p.m.

Lunch (on your own)

1:15 - 3:00 p.m.

Plenary Sessions

1:15 - 2:00 p.m.

Program Status/Questions and Answers **Salon II, 7th Floor**

Speaker: Bob DeGrasse, Director, Office of Worker and Community Transition

2:00 - 3:00 p.m .

Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise **Salon II 7th Floor**

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speaker: Robert A. Hoover, President, University of Idaho



Dr. Hoover served on the Commission on Maintaining United States Nuclear Weapons Expertise chaired by Admiral H.G. Chiles which was tasked by the Congress to “develop a plan for recruiting and retaining within the Department of Energy nuclear weapons complex such scientific, engineering and technical personnel..in order to permit the Department to maintain over the long-term a safe and reliable nuclear weapons stockpile without engaging in underground nuclear testing.” Dr. Hoover will discuss findings and recommendations made by the Commission to address challenges in maintaining a robust, capable work force to meet the stockpile stewardship.

3:00 - 3:30 p.m .

Break

3:30 - 5:00 p.m.

Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 2

2A.

Labor Policy for Privatization**Salon II, 7th Floor**

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Walter Howes, Contract Reform and Privatization Project Office

Bob Alvarez, Office of the Secretary, Department of Energy

John Meese, Metal Trades Department, AFL-CIO

Richard Miller, Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers

Mary Ellen Boyd, Building and Construction Trades Department,

AFL-CIO

This session will discuss policy options for work force and labor relations issues related to changes in contracting mechanisms including privatization and outsourcing. The Department is seeking to establish policies to create a cooperative rather than confrontational labor-management environment for dealing with potential changes in contracting mechanisms.

2B.

Training and Re-skilling the Work Force**Salon F-H, 5th Floor**

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, ORISE

Speakers: Virginia Geer, United Auto Workers/General Motors Center for Human Resources

John Clabaugh, AlliedSignal, Inc., Kansas City

Vickie Stephens, IAMAW

This session will discuss challenges in managing federal and contractor training programs to assure that they are part of strategic plans to meet operational requirements and are conducted in a cost-effective manner. The session will particularly focus on the role that training can play in addressing fluctuations in skills requirements with the existing work force.

6:00 - 8:00 p.m.

Reception**Salon D, 5th Floor****FRIDAY, MAY 28, 1999**

8:30 - 10:00 a.m.

Plenary Session



Early Site Closures

Salon F-H, 5th Floor

Moderator: G. Leah Dever, Ohio Field Office

Speakers: John Bradburne, Fluor Daniel Fernald
Gene Branham, Fernald Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Ann Bormolini, Kaiser-Hill Company, Rocky Flats
Jerry Harden, United Steelworkers of America

Representatives from the Mound Plant, Fernald and Rocky Flats will share their on-going experiences in the accelerated closure of the site. It will include discussions of cross-cutting issues including work force planning, skills mix, and training for future employment opportunities both inside and outside DOE. This challenge affects DOE, contractors, work force/labor, and the community and will require innovative and creative solutions.

10:00 - 10:30 a.m.

Break

10:30 - 12:00 noon

Group Discussions - Concurrent Session 3

3A.

Long-Range Manpower Planning Challenges

Salon F-H, 5th Floor

Moderator: Marilyn Balcombe, ORISE

Speakers: Charles Emery, Sandia National Laboratory
Carl Scarbrough, Atomic Trades and Labor Council
Susan Alexander, Lockheed Martin Energy Systems

This session will discuss approaches to assure the ability to recruit and retain a quality work force with the necessary skills and experience to meet developing Departmental missions. A particular focus will be on responding to the recommendations of the Chiles Report, and on ways to best meet fluctuating work skill requirements.

3B.

Pension and Benefits Portability

**Avenue Ballroom
4th Floor**

Moderator: Barry Lawson, Lawson and Associates

Speakers: Terry Freese, Office of Worker and Community Transition
Teresa Riggs, Bechtel Jacobs, Oak Ridge
Sharon Ruehl, Richland Operations Office
Eugene McConville, UPGWA
Michael Cleghorn, NCSI

Pension and benefits portability is a critical issue in implementing changes in contracting mechanisms at DOE facilities. This session will identify characteristics of a variety of approaches to this issue, discuss two recent experiences for dealing with this issue at DOE sites, and discuss proposals for addressing cross-site issues.